National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Ethnographic Narratives of Korean-Canadian Youth: Ethnicity, Difference, Culture, and Identity Construction

BY

Jeongmin Eom ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in
partial fulfillment of the requirements of
the degree of Master of Education

IN

International/Intercultural Education

Department of Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1996

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-10781-7

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of author: Jeongmin Eom

Title of thesis: Ethnographic Narratives of Korean-Canadian Youth: Ethnicity, Difference, Culture, and Identity Construction

Degree: Master of Education

Year this degree was granted: 1996

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purpose only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in this thesis, and except as herein before provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Jeongmin Eom

157-67 Samcheong-dong, Jonro-ku
Seoul, South Korea 110-230

Date: March 22, 1996

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Ethnographic Narratives of Korean–Canadian Youth: Ethnicity, Difference, Culture, and Identity Construction* submitted by Jeongmin Eom in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Education in International/ Intercultural Education.

Dr. M. Assheton-Smith
Co-Supervisor

Dr. Toh Swee-Hin
Co-Supervisor

Dr. P.A. Saram

Date: March 7, 1996

Dedication

Whatever is valuable in this thesis, I dedicate it to the children and educators in Canada and their futures.

I dedicate all my effort, time, tears and joy that I have taken up for this thesis to my father-in-law, Hoe-Young Yu, who provided me with warm support, but who could not wait for sharing this moment.

Abstract

While ethnicity in the Canadian multi-cultural context tends to have long been treated as an unproblematic category, recent literature has strongly posed critical questions on the process of its construction through representational systems, particularly hierarchical social organization of 'difference'. This study primarily explores the narratives of lived-experience of some second generation Korean-Canadian youth in Edmonton and how their ethnic identity is constructed with reference to notions of race, difference, culture, minority and 'Canadian'. Following a Cultural Studies tradition, particular focus is given to understanding and critically reflecting on the ordinary discourses on race and ethnicity and the ways and sites in which the participants are struggling with, resisting to and/or limited by representational systems on ethnicity, race and 'Canadian'.

Among other conclusions, the importance of youth having physical and social spaces in which they can share their 'differences' as well as their commonalities is highlighted. Some 'methodological' concerns in studying (ethnic) identity as well as other educational implications particularly with regards to multicultural/anti-racist education and the issue of citizenship and democratic participation are drawn as the researcher's theoretical inquiries and empirical understanding dialogue with each other.

Acknowledgements

There are numerous people to whom I owe thanks: the participants of this study, research collaborators, the committee members, friends and colleagues.

I would like to express my special thanks to:

- Dr. Marilyn Assheton-Smith without whose understanding and encouragement this thesis would not have been possible: I appreciate your patience, trust and inspiration, which I have found the most important grounds for the learner.

- Dr. Toh Swee-Hin, my teacher and friend, for his ongoing support throughout my program: From your example and commitment, I have learned more than what you have taught me.

- All my friends, colleagues and/or teachers: Hijin Park, my dear friend and inspiring colleague for her emotional support and valuable comments; John Nyambe who was my companion throughout the thesis writing process; Virginia Floresca-Cawagas, Noreen Bell, Ann Chinnery, Jane Cha, Richard Akankwasa, Almina Pardhan, Shirley Hardman, and Gloria Filax for their e-mails, friendship and/or proofreading and comments.

- My family: my family-in-law for their patience and support even in the midst of loss of the loved, my father-in-law; my sister, Jae-min and my brother, Seung-wook for their love; my husband, Jinseog Yu for his e-mails and late night phone calls from North Carolina and all the laughter and warmth that they brought to me and encouraged me to keep going; and, most of all, I owe the greatest debt to my parents whose ongoing love has sustained me.

- All those who have directly or indirectly engaged in my life and helped me grow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

THE AREA OF INTEREST 1

A NOTE ON METHOD 3

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 5

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: REFRAMING ETHNICITY AND IDENTITY 7

INTRODUCTION 7

REFRAMING ETHNICITY 9

Ethnicity: Categorization, Identity, and Power *10*

Ethnicity: Units of Analysis and Remapping *13*

The Micro and Macro aspect... .... *15*

THEORIZING 'IDENTITY': IDENTITY FORMATION 16

Other notes on identity and society *19*

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS **21**

INTRODUCTION 21

RESEARCH PROCEDURE 21

Prior to data collection *22*

Participants *23*

Procedures for Data collection *24*

Data analysis: Overall Procedure *26*

READING & RE-PRESENTING THE NARRATIVES 27

Critical Ethnography *28*

Tactics of Reading: Comparison, Contrasting, Contextualizing *29*

OTHER METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES 30

"I" as an ethnographer *30*

Trustworthiness *32*

Issue of 'rigor' *32*

LIMITATION AND DELIMITATION 33

Practical concerns *33*

Theoretical delimitation *34*

SUMMARY AND RESTATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION 34

CHAPTER FOUR: NARRATIVE I : ANDREW **36**

INTRODUCTION 36
AS A MEMBER OF AN 'IMMIGRANT' FAMILY 37
'KOREAN' AS A POSITIVE SELF-IDENTIFICATION 39
ETHNIC IDENTITY AS 'VISIBLE MINORITY' IDENTITY: "I'M JUST KOREAN ANYWAY" 41
'WHITE' IMAGERY REFLECTED ON 'VISIBLE MINORITY' SELF-IMAGE 46
'ETHNIC', CANADA, AND MULTI-CULTURES 49
ETHNICITY AND INVISIBLE CENTER 53
SUMMARY 55

CHAPTER FIVE: NARRATIVE II: STANLEY **58**

INTRODUCTION 58
BEING/BECOMING 'ETHNIC' 60
"I am Korean": A Source of Defensiveness in the Form of a Defense Strategy *60*
Peer, Family and 'Difference': Desire of Invisibility and Inescapable 'Visibility'. *63*
Dislocation and Marginality *66*
Learning and Practicing 'Culture' *68*
Future-Making and Tracing-Back: 'Roots' As a Departure *72*
A place for 'ethnicity' in multi-cultural Canada *73*
COMMUNITY OF INCLUSION AND CONFINED MARGINALITY 75
SUMMARY 78

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS/REFLEXION **82**

DIFFERENCE, 'MINORITY', CULTURE AND SENSE OF ETHNIC/RACIAL SELF 82
'Power' and 'Resistance' in Methodology *90*
SOME EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSES AND ISSUES 91
SITES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 96

BIBLIOGRAPHY **99**

APPENDIX A : GROUP INTERVIEW **108**

APPENDIX B: SALLY **117**

APPENDIX C : SAMANTHA **121**

`Chapter One
Introduction

The area of interest

This present study deals with some aspects of the issue of ethnic identity construction in Canada. Generally speaking, what triggered my initial interest in this issue came mainly from two directions. One of them is the societal peculiarity of Canadian multi-culturalism[1] where 'ethnicity' is perceived as a definitive aspect of the social identity of Canada's citizens or, putting it more precisely, its 'ethnic minority' citizens. The other is the burgeoning literature on 'identity' and its relationship to education and educational issues in Canada and elsewhere in the world.

Canada claims to be a multi-cultural society, and such a claim stems from its recognition of 'ethnic diversity': 'Culture' in Canadian multi-culturalism synonymously refers to 'ethnic' and thus Canada's multi-ethnic character. An underlying premise is that people of a certain ethnic group are not only the people of "a common heritage" but also that they "presumably share a common experience" (Li, 1990: 4) and a common 'culture'. What is often found in the literature on multiculturalism and/or ethnicity which carries the above premise is that 'ethnicity' in Canada tends to be dealt with as if it reflected an 'objective condition' of members of the society as 'ethnic' groups are treated as stable and homogeneous entities. Thus, not unlike dominant tendencies in mainstream American research on ethnicity and race, Canadian multi-culturalism seems to rely on a particular social understanding which defines [ethnic] 'difference' in terms of

---

[1] When I write about 'multi-culturalism' in the 'Canadian context' it does not refer to multiculturalism as a specific governmental policy. Although 'official' discourse, as part of dominant discourse, goes with - not without - principles of national policy, what I mean by 'multi-culturalism' in this study refers to multi-culturalism as a prevailing social phenomenon and discourse in Canada, which seems to have become more than 'common-sense' rhetoric. It not only functions as a distinctive indicator to distinguish Canadian society from any other society (e.g. the 'mosaic' metaphor in comparison to the 'melting pot' metaphor) but also is held to serve as one of the primary underpinnings - by and large, unexamined - for the democratic practice of its citizens. A hyphen within the term throughout this text is used to display the meaning intended as described here.

"transcendental essences" (McCarthy& Crichlow, 1993) and 'culture' as a static and inherent entity. As a result, while literature on ethnic relations has been flourishing, in the vast majority of cases the focus has tended to be on the issue of - given or presumed - 'cultural diversity and conflict' among 'ethnic' groups. Certain questions inquiring into the very notion and meanings of 'ethnicity' in asymmetrical social relations , such as what 'ethnicity' signifies in regards to social relations, how it is socially produced and re-produced and/or how 'difference' is socially organized are seldom brought to light.

On the other hand, in the literature focusing mainly on ethnic identity at a more micro-level, dominant tendencies are to explore the question of how 'ethnicity' functions at individual levels; 'individuals' and their perceptions are dealt with as if they were atomized as well as autonomous units of analysis, independent of 'society' or the wider structure of social relationships and settings. As one critic puts it, theories of ethnicity in Canadian literature still "remain locked into a cultural discourse that demands that inequalities within Canadian society be understood within a framework of individual, psychological, and cultural [in an essentialist sense] phenomena" (Young, 1987: 10)

Along with this particular context of Canadian multi-culturalism, where 'ethnicity' is deemed to 'matter' in various ways, the issue of social identity has recently been re-introduced in diverse disciplines, including education, with new approaches and criticisms. For instance, some educators including Giroux (1993), McLaren (1992) and Aronowitz and Giroux (1990) have brought the issue of identity into critical pedagogy by highlighting its multidimensional, boundary-shifting and political nature, and by introducing the notion of border pedagogy. As well, in Cultural Studies where the intersection between (political) power relations and cultural practices is the central locus of interest and contention (Grossberg, 1993), emerging new discourses have politicized the notion of ethnicity and identity.

Hence, the issue of ethnic identity construction as the subject of this study is explored not to search for specific types or patterns of 'ethnic identity'. Rather, following a particular set of assumptions and perspectives on ethnic identity formation which will be elaborated in the conceptual framework discussed below, I am interested in the narrators' tensions, contradictions and resistance in relation to being/becoming 'ethnic' as well as their discourses on ethnicity, race and selfhood within or against which their desires, consciousness, values and dreams are defined, confined, interpellated, and refined.

> Canada changes and Canada remains the same. Who establishes the change (who counts?) and who experiences the changes as arriving from somewhere and somebody else? Socially organized subjection (exploitation, oppression, subordination) are still daily occurrences which are connected with longer waves of historical experience. Some of these are now being named for what they are: institutional racism, sexism and classism. But often times they are not so named, they are not voiced (in this sense), they are quietly suffered and endured without thereby entering into the social identities of those who are subjected to the status of objects or categories that are socially denying and self-reducing. (Corrigan, 1987: 13)

Shifting the focus of physical site from 'educational institution' to everyday discourses and lived-experience of the individuals, the present study poses a set of similar questions in a similar vein: Who are the subjects and the objects of multiculturalism, minority discourse, and both changes that are imposed and dreamed? How and in what forms does 'socially organized subjection' appear as a 'daily occurrence'? How are those designated as ethnic minority youth experiencing, subjected to and interpellating this designation? How are they limited and do they limit themselves in their ordinary discourses? The overarching broad research question with which I began this study is: "How is ethnic identity constructed among second generation Korean-Canadian youth in Edmonton?"

A note on method

Details of the methodology will be elaborated in chapter two. However, it needs to be noted here that the question of how individuals display resistance and address tensions and contradictions associated with 'becoming ethnic' will be addressed by analyzing discourses produced through interview settings. Seven young men and women who have a Korean background were interviewed and six of their narratives were analyzed in relation to how they spoke to the research questions. Of the six, two narratives proved especially valuable as the young men who presented them were relatively eloquent and able to speak at some length; these two narratives form the core of the data for the thesis.

One caveat about the nature of this work needs to be issued. At first glance, this thesis may be looked upon as 'an empirical study on adolescent Korean-Canadians in Edmonton' with a focus on their ethnic identity construction. This is true to the extent that the ethnographic research part of this thesis deals with the issue of ethnic identity among some second generation Korean-Canadian adolescents. However, it can be misleading if one reads this thesis merely as research *about* "a certain ethnic group" or its "community". The study should rather be deemed "an exploration of the issue of ethnic identity through the narratives provided by young Korean-Canadians in Edmonton". By saying this, I do not intend to deny the specificity of the participants in this study. This specificity is significant because the subjects *exist* not merely as 'narrators' but as real people engaging in everyday life.[2]

Nevertheless, it should still be noted that, as ethnographic cultural criticism, what this present study attempts is beyond documenting a typology of a certain group of people categorized as such. The rationale of the study was triggered by "the conviction that 'ethnic identity matters' in senses that have been neglected or glossed over in existing scholarly traditions".[3] Thus, one of the main - maybe 'tacit' since it is omnipresent throughout the thesis rather than explicitly articulated - purposes of this thesis is to interrogate the conventional use of the notion of ethnic identity, not necessarily by directly "criticizing" it but rather by offering a different approach to the issue which in turn will (I hope) disturb and challenge the dominant and unproblematized way of dealing with it. Putting a priority to this rationale, the selection of "Korean-Canadians" as the subjects of the study can be seen as secondary: it could be regarded as *an* exemplar of the exploration of the complexity of identity construction as it relates to 'ethnicity' among the second generation of a visible minority in Canada.[4]

---

[2] As well, it is far from saying that the narratives, as mere 'stories', are only the 'texts' that this study explores: I believe that approach of reading the text at the expense of the death of the author, which is so "trendy" in postmodern literary criticism, needs to be critically re-examined when the study deals with ethnographic narratives, especially if its cost is mere abstraction and thus, 'disappearance' of the 'subjects', which leaves only the 'stories' behind. For a more detailed critique on this matter, see McLaren, 1992, especially pp. 124-6.

[3] This phrase is borrowed from an article by Morrow (1991: 155) in which the characteristics of newly emerging 'cultural studies' are addressed. The original phrase says 'culture matters'.

Significance of the study

> In our society, youth is present only when its presence is a problem, or is regarded as a problem. More precisely, the category "youth" gets mobilized in official documentary discourse, in concerned or outraged editorials and features, or in the supposedly disinterested tracts emanating from the social sciences at those times when young people make their presence felt by going "out of bounds", by resisting through rituals, dressing strangely, striking bizarre attitudes, breaking rules, breaking bottles, windows, heads, issuing rhetorical challenges to the law. (Dick Hebridge, 1988, quoted in Giroux, 1994: 278)

The dominant discourse of 'ethnic minority' youth seems to follow a vein similar to the one outlined for youth by Hebridge. In educational discourse, 'ethnic minority' youth are usually discussed in terms of 'deficiency' or 'disadvantage' particularly in regards to 'failure' in school performance. Although such an approach may be justified in the sense that to be ethnic - and any - 'minority' in a society in which mainstream 'non-ethnic' norms prevail becomes a source of 'disadvantage' rather than 'advantage', its perspective is still problematic. That is, if we look at the phenomenon differently such discourses have tended not only to be limited within, but also to reproduce without critical interrogations, the pathological construction of minority youth 'deficiency' while insidiously and implicitly endorsing societal mainstream 'norms'.

One intent of this study is to seek a way in which those 'ethnic minority' youth are not 'objectified' as 'deficient' 'targets' upon whom multicultural education and policy needs to be applied and imposed, but can be reconstructed as the subjects who are both passively and actively engaging in cultural production and reproduction and whose selfhood is interpellating and interpellated. Related to this, my position as well as question and interest, which is rather distant from the actual empirical part of the study yet persistently borne out while conducting this study, departed from the premise that the issue of ethnic inequality in education can be treated independently from the issue of citizenship, participation and pluralistic democracy. Social equality and justice can flourish only in the true sense of 'participation' when participation is of citizens "*with* properties".[5]

---

[4] This way of putting the issue can also allude to my refusal to create *another* generalizible typology for Koreans as an 'ethnic' group in North America.

---

[5] This notion of a 'citizens with properties' is borrowed from David Lloyd's (1990) notion of the "subject without properties", which will be briefly revisited in the final chapter.

Chapter Two

Conceptual Framework: Reframing Ethnicity and Identity

Introduction

By and large, although the following chapter addresses 'method' or questions of 'technique'(Bourdieu et al., 1991) for this research, the conceptual framework presented in this chapter can be seen as constituting part of my methodology in that it explicates "how [I] go about studying whatever is of interest" and, in so doing, this section "relates to the process of inquiry" (Rosenau, 1992: 116.) With that in mind, the aim of this chapter is twofold. First, I wish to explicate how ethnic identity and some other relevant notions and concepts will be understood, explored and discussed in this study. For this, I will discuss selected theories on the formation of ethnic identity, but not as theoretical models to be applied to the data. At the risk of oversimplification, I may say that theories raised in this section can be distinguished into two different orientations by their understanding of the nature and usage of 'theory': some are conventional theories on ethnicity and identity as 'analytical frames or tools' and some are newly emerging theories which are best understood as 'critical discourses on ethnicity and identity'.

It should be mentioned that as a kind of Cultural Studies project, this study bears the spirit of attempts to interrogate the phenomenon in a way for which no 'prevailing' tradition fully provides grounds. As Stuart Hall puts it, the act of critical inquiry has "no absolute beginnings" and "few unbroken continuities" nor is it "the endless unwinding of 'tradition'" (Hall, 1994). Instead, as Hall continues, there will be:

> ...an untidy but characteristic unevenness of development ... [and] significant breaks - where old lines of thought are disrupted, older constellations displaced, and elements, old and new, are regrouped around a different set of premises and themes. (Ibid.: 520)

By its nature, Cultural Studies is deemed to be an interdisciplinary area (Hall, 1994; Morrow, 1991). Roland Barthes notes that for a work to be truly interdisciplinary does not mean "confronting already constituted disciplines" nor merely choosing a "subject" (a theme) and gathering around it two or three sciences" but rather requires "creating a new object that belongs to no one" (Barthes, quoted in Clifford and Marcus, 1986: 1). Nevertheless, to draw starting points, some rather fragmented discussions on selected dominant approaches from various disciplines seems to be in order. This may also help to clarify terms and notions used in the text, so as to reduce terminological confusion, which seems to be necessary since an extensive literature review of both theoretical and empirical studies from diverse orientations and approaches reveals that the issue of 'ethnicity' or 'ethnic identity' is an almost chaotic field of study.

'Ethnicity' has long been one of the popular themes in anthropology as well as sociology in the context of Canada, whereas the issue of identity, particularly identity development, has also been one of the central themes of (cognitive) psychology and educational psychology, as well as more recently of feminist and post-structural analyses. Given the impossibility of adequately discussing all of the theories of ethnicity and ethnic identity that are introduced here, I concentrate on partial aspects and problems that I believe to be most relevant and significant in shifting discourse on the subject, as well as clarifying the terminology. This will particularly evolve around such selective issues as category vs. identity in relation to the notion of ethnicity, the subjective vs. the objective or the self vs. the other in identity formation, and the macro- vs. micro- levels of social relations, all of which seem to me to be central domains to be clarified in order to launch a study on "lived-experience" without dismissing the intersection of that lived experience with larger social contexts.

Theories of ethnic identity which I label critical discourses will provide insights into the angle from which the notion of ethnic identity is approached and, in turn, may enable the particular way of reading the narratives that follow to be intelligible. Those theories do not constitute a single, coherent body of knowledge but rather certain aspects are selectively brought in and discussed. These theoretical choices, I believe, following what Jane Flax maintains, are justified "without recourse to 'truth' and domination" (1990: 222), but rather in terms of a "search for meanings". Since my theoretical choices have a definite bearing on the contents and forms of questions to be raised and asked about and through the narratives, this conceptual framework also engages in introducing and contextualizing the particular concerns and questions on the issue, to foreshadow which particular aspects and meanings of ethnic identity construction will be sought and explored in the narrative reading that follows. This is the second, although not unrelated to the first, aspect of this conceptual framework.

Reframing ethnicity

As Isajiw (1974) points out, "[w]hat ethnicity 'really is' is not a factual, but a definitional matter" (quoted in Buchignani & Letkemann, 1994: 204): That is, there is no consensus about meanings of ethnicity but a set of approaches to, perspectives on, or ways of understanding based upon which a given analyst defines 'ethnicity'. Yet, 'dominant' approaches can be identified. In the majority of studies, whether sociological, anthropological or psychological, 'ethnicity' is commonly taken either as 'situational' or 'primordial'/'cultural', and there are a number of arguments on each of these views. However, when it is noted that "[i]n a sense, ethnicity is created by the analyst when he or she goes out into the world and poses questions about ethnicity" (Eriksen, 1993: 16), it is important to also note that situational or primordial/cultural approaches to it have definite bearings both on assumptions carried into a study and on the particular interests and questions that may arise. Hence, I share with Jenkins the position that to argue whether ethnicity is either primordial or situational is pointless and futile (Jenkins, 1994). Instead, as I pose the question of ethnic identity construction, bearing in mind the rationales and interests raised in the introduction, the issue in this present study ceases to be 'What is ethnicity (or even ethnic identity)?' and becomes 'How and when is it invoked?'[6] Some relevant questions then could be such as 'How is a particular discourse on ethnicity invoked?', 'How does it stand in relation to other discourses?' or even some questions exploring the domains beyond 'discourse'. In this sense, what I wish to address about those perspectives is what aspects of their underlying assumptions and posed questions are not only problematic but also inadequate and inappropriate for this study. Taking these critiques as a point of departure, the new set of theories can be introduced and specified.

---

[6] Here I borrowed the structure of Silverman's phrase (1989: 220) that he uses to pose his own questions.

Ethnicity: Categorization, Identity, and Power

Ethnicity, has long been treated as rather stable and less of a political category than race and class, although the concept has been redefined as its boundary continues to be reshaped (Williams, 1989). By and large, the emphasis on the stability of the ethnic category which overshadows other approaches mainly stems from the relatively salient and stable criterion of the category, that is, 'origin of ancestry', which is 'given at birth' and which Keyes (1976: 210) labels as the "primordial quality" of ethnicity. While the criterion of classification itself appears rather simple and salient, the assumptions and meanings that such a classification may entail create a great deal of debate and disagreement.

To account for the feature of 'ethnicity' and the nature of its boundary constitution, some studies conceptualize ethnicity in terms of the internal group identification of the members, as opposed to the externally imposed categorization. For instance, Jenkins (1987) makes a binary distinction between internal group identification and external categorization and attaches the term ethnicity to the former. Mason (1990) summarizes this point provided by Jenkins:

> Jenkins argues that it is important not to confuse the process of *group identification*, which takes place among those inside an ethnic boundary, and *categorisation*, which takes place from the outside. Jenkins argues that ethnicity is generally a matter associated with the first of these processes (an 'us' statement), while 'race' and racism (as products of domination) are associated with the second". (Mason, 1990: 125-6: emphasis in original)

According to this view, membership and group identification, or 'identity' in a restricted sense, are the most significant elements in the constitution of ethnic boundaries. Although Jenkins is concerned more with macroscopic understanding of the notion, a similar point - a binary dichotomy between the 'subjective' or 'internal' identification and the 'objective' or 'external' categorization' - can be found in other more microscopic studies. Once the focus is shifted to the manifestation of ethnicity at the microscopic level, that is, at the level of individual actors, then, 'ethnicity' within this framework of the internal group identification may be deemed as 'situational'. Thernstrom et al. (1980) note this situational nature of ethnicity:

> Ethnic identification, even when ethnic heritage is unmixed or fully understood, is a matter of individual choice, ratified on a continuum from passive acquiescence to active participation, from denial through mild curiosity to passionate commitment. It may change over time and may vary from one situation to another. (1980: vii)

In other words, if ethnicity is solely the matter of internal group associations and one's consciousness of them, then "variability in the affirmation of ethnic identity may be dependent upon the immediate social situation, and it relates this variability to the actor's [subjective] perception of that situation" (Okamura, 1981: 452). Following Fredrick Barth's conceptualization of ethnicity, Sandra Wallman (1979) elaborates this point:

> [T]wo sets of people with common cultural origins placed in similar minority positions [will not] necessarily use the same elements of their traditional culture to mark themselves off from non-member 'others'. What they do use will depend on the resources they have, on what they hope to achieve (whether consciously or not) and on the range of options available to them at the time. (Wallman, 1979: 5-6)

The situational approach to the notion of ethnicity is most common in microscope exploration where 'individuals' are the subject under study. Bearing this perspective in mind, authors on situational ethnicity contend that what matters more than the content of the ethnic categories which designates distinctiveness and differences among groups is the process of ethnic affirmation of the members through which ethnic boundaries are created and maintained. The problem with the viewpoint that conceptualizes ethnicity solely in terms of internal group identification is that it fails to recognize the dynamics of boundary formation involving both members and non-members. For instance, it can be argued that authors writing on situational ethnicity, such as Wallman, make "no reference to the creation of boundaries by others, [i.e.] by 'non-members', defining the group" but merely "point to the internal contribution to the creation of boundaries (Assheton-Smith, from an unpublished note, 1995). Worsley writes of the problems residing in the situational view where ethnicity is conceptualized in terms of 'individual choice' as some theorists such as Barth may emphasize:

> Many interactionist studies of ethnicity at the level of the community are vitiated by a liberal metaphysic developed in open socie-

> ties, where a degree of choice exists for the individual to consciously decide whether to assimilate or not, and where social mobility is permitted and significant. The individual is thus taken as the jumping-off point in the analysis, and choice is assumed to be the crucial social fact. Life, it would seem, is a market, or a cafeteria. (Worsley, 1984: 246)

Another problem of the view taking ethnicity as 'situational', 'primordial', or solely a matter of 'internal' identification is that the relationship between category and identity in formation of ethnic boundary is made less clear cut (Mason, 1990). Although some theorists who take the situational approach may still acknowledge that "no one can take up an option which is not there" (Wallman, 1986: 233), their notion of the 'constraint' still restrictively refers to the choices limited by the fact that available sets of ascription adherent to ethnic identity are not arbitrarily created by ethnic group members but are usually given and preassigned to individuals and the groups they belong to. What this view does not yet take into consideration, however, is that the very meanings and existence of such boundaries are not created solely by individuals either. Neither do all the groups possess equal power to create the meanings. In other words, conventional approaches, whether situational or cultural, hardly call into question what 'being ethnic' can signify and how its meanings can created by political hegemony.

On this matter, Brackette Williams (1989) provides insightful criticism in a more polemical vein. Examining studies of ethnicity, established on the distinctive roles of the actors' subjective perception vs. objective classification or situations, the self vs. the other and the like, Williams contends that such a retention of the roles of distinctive 'factors', while useful for the specification of ethnic identity, fails to recognize asymmetrical power distributions that signify the very act and implications of boundary constitution, which are contrary to the seeming neutrality of the analytic roles of the distinctive factors themselves. Thus, while acknowledging the usefulness of the conceptual device of recognizing a distinctive dichotomy between the subjective vs. the objective and the self vs. the other, which is popularly used in both anthropological and sociological analysis, particularly for the specification of ethnic identity, Williams (1989) argues that we must understand the role of unequal power distribution in identity formation in the political realm and real life situations into which political implications constantly penetrate and inform the nature of 'meaning'. (Jenkins expresses a similar point in his 1994 article.)

Or, in Williams' terms again:

> [A]nalyses of identity formation processes within a population that shares a political unit require the recognition that not all individuals have equal power to fix the coordinates of self-other identity formation. Nor are individuals equally empowered to opt out of the labeling process, to become the invisible against which others' visibility is measured. The illusion that self and other ascriptions among groups are made on equal terms fades when we ask whether those who identify themselves with a particular ethnic identity could also successfully claim *no* ethnic identification. If their group became the dominant power group in the political unit such a claim might be possible. Although an "objective" outsider might still label them ethnic, within the context of their political unit their ethnicity [like that of A. Cohen's (1981) London tribe of businessmen] would become politically "invisible"." (Williams, 1989: 420)

Ethnicity: Units of Analysis and Remapping

By and large, ethnicity refers to classification of people by the criterion of ethnic difference, and a "descent-based definition of individuals" (Williams, 1989: 416) is most commonly used to classify this ethnic difference. By definition, ethnicity, however elaborated by the researcher, conveys this connoted facet of categorization. Ethnic categorizations in the field of social science are inevitably created for analytical purposes (Eriksen, 1993; Mason, 1990). As Mason puts it, "it is impossible to discuss any aspect of social life - either politically or academically - without making use of categories" (Mason, 1990: 128). However, as is true with any categorizations to a greater or lesser degree, any categorical mapping of ethnicity soon becomes problematic since "the territory it describes is more complex than (the category)" (Eriksen, 1993: 66). 'Ethnicity' is known as a term that is "among the least stable in the academic vocabulary" (Berry & Laponce, 1994: 4-5), and its instability reflects the nature of a term in which analytic categorization is constantly threatened by shifting boundaries and transformation of political meanings in the social world, through historical change and societal contexts. In this sense, it is particularly unstable in this rapidly globalizing/modern world, a world in which increasing resistance and contestations generated by the tension between globalization as a cultural phenomenon and local identity as a political struggle, is constantly being waged by the 'local' populations.

While the prescribed categorization may overshadow identity formation, what is at stake is the dynamics of the identity formation process in which any assumed "primordial quality" of ethnicity may reproduce, reinforce, modify, and/or transform the meanings and significance of ethnicity, not only at the levels of the material conditions and subjective interpretations of individuals but also in terms of the dynamic interplay and intersection between individual, intellectual and political materialities and discourses at a given time and in a given space. In this sense, the term, ethnicity, is not a mere analytical concept. What complicates the conceptualization of the term is that both everyday life and acts of individuals as well as political boundaries, meanings and power relations beyond it constitute the units of the concept. In other words, analytical classification of ethnicity cannot be autonomous from lay and political classification and their meanings. This dynamic nature of the notion and its significance is well pointed out in the following paragraph:

> Like race and class, ... ethnicity, along with the systems of classification associated with each of them in different places, has been, and continues to be, the product of combined scientific [I would rather say 'conceptual' or 'analytical'], lay, and political classification. As a result, contemporary efforts to understand what these concepts label, and what place these labels mark in the identity-formation process, must identify the assumptions underlying the linkages among their lay, political, and scientific meanings. (Williams, 1989: 402)

In addition to the above but not unrelated to it, the map of the notion of ethnicity as a unit of study in regards to other relevant and related units of the study needs to be reconfigured. In the majority of empirical studies on ethnic identity, whether sociological or anthropological, either categorized group membership is based on the stable "primordial quality" of ethnicity or the individual member is taken as the sole and isolated unit of analysis, while what is largely ignored is the need for mapping this unit within (an)other larger unit within which ethnicity not only 'exists' but also 'comes to matter'. It is this 'mapping', which enables us to understand the relational nature of ethnicity, not ethnicity as an analytical unit used to account for distinctiveness of a number of 'ethnic' groups and their inter- or intra- relations.

As pointed out earlier, remapping the significance of ethnicity in terms of power relations is called upon in order to understand how ethnicity within a single political unit, that is, the nation-state, comes to matter. As Williams (1989: 420) contends, while ethnic distinctiveness is not determined solely by power relations, "when cultural distinctiveness becomes a criterion of group identity formation in a single political unit, it is certainly a product of the power relations existing among citizens of that unit". In this respect, the notion of ethnicity within the nation state needs to be explored in relation to the national identity:

> [t]he concept of ethnicity, whether defined in terms of nested segments or horizontal interest groups, is most useful when used as a label for a dimension of the identity formation process in a single political unit, most specifically the nation-state. In order to enhance our understanding of social stratification, its definition must direct attention to the role of cultural distinctiveness in conceptions of citizenship, loyalty, and the other precepts of nationalist ideologies institutionalized under different state modes of political integration (Williams, 1989: 421).....[In this respect, it should be noted that] as part of the same identity formation process, concepts of race, ethnicity, locality, and nationality competitively label different aspects of that process. (Ibid.: 426)

The Micro and Macro aspect...

The problem is, however, not alone the previously indicated problematic of a binary dichotomy between the 'subjective' and the 'objective', for the analytical distinction among 'different levels' becomes less clear in their actual operations. In their study on racial formation in the United States, Omi and Winant (1986) explains this inseparable and intertwined operation of different levels of social relations:

> The racial order is organized and enforced by the continuity and reciprocity between these two 'levels' of social relations. The micro- and macro-levels, however, are only analytically distinct. In our lived experience, in politics, in culture, in economic life, they are contiguous and reciprocal. (Omi & Winant, 1986: 67)

In sum, 'ethnicity' can be "adequately defined neither solely in cultural terms nor as a purely situational phenomenon" (Williams, 1989: 402). While a number of studies, once acknowledging this, perceive 'ethnicity' as the combination of both, what I wish to emphasize by this is the necessity to reconceptualize 'ethnicity' outside of such perspectives but in terms of identity formation - and identity formation as understood by some particular (social constructivist/post-structuralist) theories of identity. The following section discusses how 'identity' can be theorized in a way in which 'ethnicity' can be discussed beyond the framework of those perspectives.

Theorizing 'Identity': Identity Formation

In many cases, particularly in group-oriented sociological research, ethnic identity tends to be operationalized as a stable variable measured by sets of ascribed characteristics. Since the central concern and interest of those variable oriented studies, which operationally construct ethnic identity, is to identify the specification of ethnic identity, objective primordial features or perhaps Weberian 'ideal types' of ethnicity or identity are preconceptualized for the referents to account for the empirical world. The formation of identity, which is the focus of interest in this study, however, differs from identity types. Berger and Luckmann (1966) outline the difference between the two as follows:

> Identity is a phenomenon that emerges from the dialectic between individual and society. Identity *types*, on the other hand, are social products *tout court*, relatively stable elements of objective social reality (the degree of stability being, of course, socially determined in its turn). As such, they are the topic of some form of theorizing in any society, even if *(or should we say as if?)* they are stable and the formation of individual identities is relatively unproblematic. (174, emphasized phrase added)

While identity types, as Berger and Luckmann (1966) argues, are "'observable' and 'verifiable' in pretheoretical experience", identity remains "unintelligible unless it is located in a world" (174) or, in other words, within some theories of identity. Theories about identity are, in turn, "always embedded in the more comprehensive theories about reality" (175).

In more recent writings, new slants are being taken on ethnicity and identity. For example, Stuart Hall (1991a; 1991b; 1991c) calls for new perspectives on the issue of identity which can not only attain explanatory power to adequately reflect the rapidly changing global phenomenon, but also bring changes in discourses on identity so as to initiate social transformations toward radical democracy. Although specifics of the new perspective provided by Hall, due to its elaboration of local (British) politics, as well as a macroscopic (global) analysis, have some inappropriate elements as analytical devices for this study, its generic ideas and logic of identity seem to provide a general picture of how social identity and identity formation can be perceived, understood and approached in a way other than that proposed by more traditional theorizing.

According to Hall, the old logic of the discourse both of identity, which assumes a stable subject and an authentic 'self', and of ethnicity, which is confined to a territorially stable and fixed social identification, is inadequate in the global and rapidly changing territorial experience of people. It is imperative for radical cultural workers and educators not only to re-examine the old logic of identity in a way that can reflect the boundary shifting modern phenomenon and the diasporic nature of migrant identities but also re-construct the notion of identity in regard to the constitution of the (new) political subject and postmodern cultural hybridity. Hall maintains that "[i]dentity [needs to be discussed] as a point at which, on the one hand, a whole set of new theoretical discourses intersect and where, on the other, a whole new set of cultural practices emerges" (1991b: 42). He goes on to observe that:

> Identity is always ... a structured representation which only achieves its positive through the narrow eye of the negative. It has to go through the eye of the needle of the other before it can construct itself. (1991a: 21)

Identifying a number of intersecting discourses around questions of cultural identity, Hall (1991c) presents four particular aspects of the new discourse, which may give rise to the possibility of a radical de-centering of the stable sense of identity: historical/structural conditions, the role of the unconscious, the confinement of the language system, and the relativization of Western knowledge.

Hall (1991c) suggests that Marx's interruption to the liberal notion of the sovereign or autonomous subject reminds us of historical (or structural) conditions of identity which are not constructed by but already made and given to the subject. We as the subject are

> always constructed in part by the practices and discourses that make us, such that we cannot find within ourselves as individual selves or subjects or identities the point of origin from which discourse or history or practice originates.... [In this respect,] we are always lodged and implicated in the practices and structures of everybody else's life (and history). (Hall, 1991c: 11)

At the same time, however, history is perceived not as mechanistically deterministic but rather contingent: history must be understood as "a continuous dialectic or dialogic relationship between that which is already made and that which is making the future" (Hall, 1991c: 11). This dialectics between agency and history/structure or the subject and the social relations in identity formation is also explained in the early work of social constructionists:

> (Identity is) a key element of subjective reality, and like all subjective reality, stands in a dialectical relationship with society. Identity is formed by social processes. Once crystallized, it is maintained, modified, or even reshaped by social relations. The social processes involved in both the formation and the maintenance of identity are determined by the social structure. Conversely, the identities produced by the interplay of organism, individual consciousness and social structure react upon the given social structure, maintaining it, modifying it, or even reshaping it. Societies have histories in the course of which specific identities emerge; these histories are, however, made by men (sic) with specific identities". (Berger & Luckmann: 173)

On the matter of subjectivity, we can hardly imagine a (Cartesian?) narrator who is fully self-knowable and hence who "speaks without simultaneously being spoken" (Sarup, 1989: 1). As post-structuralists (and social constructivists) maintain, the self, as the term, 'subject' indicates, can no longer be perceived as an autonomous, fully conscious being but one situated in constructed human reality that is "a product of signifying activities which are both culturally specific and generally unconscious" (Sarup, 1989: 2).

The complete reflection of one's own identity by him/herself is not possible since identity is formed "not only [in] the line of the practice of other structures and discourses but also in a complex relationship with unconscious life" (Hall, 1991c:

11). Or, as Freud would argue, our identities are grounded not only on the conscious knowing but also the unconscious unknown. Thus, as Hall (1991c) puts it, "social, cultural and political life cannot be understood except in relationship [with] the formations of the unconscious life". In this view, self is no longer "a fully self-reflective entity" (Ibid.: 11)

Other notes on identity and society

For post-structuralists, language or language system are critical to our understanding of ourselves and our identity. For instance, for Lacan, as Sarup (1989) observes,

> ... there is no separation between self and society. Human beings become social with the appropriation of language; and it is language that constitutes us as a subject. Thus, we should not dichotomize the individual and society. Society inhabits each individual. (7)

Elaborating the linkage between society and subject through language, Flax also notes the place of unconsciousness and power relations in identity formation:

> Like the use of language, interpretation of meaning is not a purely private or unbounded process, but the rules may be so much a part of the game that it is hard to bring them to consciousness. Nor can the rules be understood solely within or as generated by language because language and discursive rules both reflect and are located within complex contexts of social relations and power. (Flax, 1990: 222)

Pierre Bourdieu, who, in spite of his different analysis of language, may still agree on this significance of language in subject constitution, brings in another aspect of identity formation, particularly that of cultural materiality and practice, in his description of habitus. John Fiske's (1992) elaboration of Bourdieu's theory of the "habitus" presents one way of understanding the complexity as well as the significance of the interactive lines of individual thoughts and actions and the social location of the individual, around the domain of social identity in everyday cultural practice.

In emphasizing its usefulness in understanding and exploring the material practices of everyday culture, Fiske explains that Bourdieu's notion of the "habitus" encompasses the meanings and interactive lines of forces of the subjects (habitant), the social environment (habitat), the processes and practices of the social being (habitation) through characteristic ways of doing things (habit). In this understanding, "habitus" can be understood as "a position in the social and a historical trajectory through it: it is the practice of being within that position and trajectory, and the social identity, the habits of thoughts, tastes and dispositions that are formed in and by those practices". In this interactive line of those forces,

> [t]he position in social space, the practices and the identities are not separate categories in a hierarchical or deterministic relation to each other, but mutually inform each other to the extent that their significance lies in their transgression of the categorical boundaries that produced the words I have to use to explain them and which are therefore perpetuated by that explanation. (Fiske, 1992: 155)

But postmodernists add another notion which is not evident in Bourdieu's work, and that is the idea of "the play of 'difference'". It seems to be used in two ways. In one usage, it refers to the 'Politics of Difference' , or the domination and subordination of groups of people through stratification or marginalization of 'difference' or societal/dominant representation of difference. In the other, it is used to refer to a radical potential of newly conceptualized identity, of identification which, as in Lacanian concept of identity, does not 'correspond' to external circumstances and thus creates a dialectic of the process of identification and the play of difference which drives ceaseless transformation (see, Homi Bhabha in Rutherford, 1990).

In effect, conceptualizing the identity formation in ways such as the above - the dialectics between structure and agency or society and subjectivity, the rupture between conscious reflection and unconscious barriers, and the confinements of re-creations of language, has a definite bearing on the way in which I interpret meanings, rhetorics, and discourses of lived-experiences in the narratives of this thesis.

Chapter Three
Research Methods

Introduction

This study has no single coherent body of method guiding the whole research procedure. Rather, there have been two phases of the research procedure, and methods for each can be identified. The overall research procedure up to the point of the initial reading of the narratives and supplementary data collection was guided by the grounded theory procedure whereas the method for the intensive reading of the interview data in interplay with literature, as well as constantly revised writing of the narrative presentation, can be identified as critical ethnography. The whole process of the research also carried major elements of ethnography because of my own status as a 'foreign' student in Canada, unfamiliar with many of the cultural patterns of the people I worked with during the research process, but that only became clear to me as the research advanced rather than something I was cognizant of from the beginning.

Research Procedure

Although the research procedure of this study cannot be defined as a grounded theory approach in a strict sense[7] (cf. Glaser & Strauss, 1976; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), the overall approach of this study from data collection to the initial analysis was inspired and advised by the literature on grounded theory. This means that some techniques and terms, which will be explicated in this section, owe their origins to grounded theory literature. Grounded theory can benefit the researcher conducting a qualitative empirical study by providing abundant tactics and explicit steps of analysis. The following are the detailed research procedures.

---

[7] This study in general may not legitimately fit under the criteria of a grounded theory study as described by the authors of grounded theory. This is true especially in that this study does not follow the 'coding' process which is an essential part of Grounded Theory procedure and in that it does not aim to generate a *formal middle range theory* that can be *generalizable* but also readily fit "what's going on" in everyday situations (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The latter is given as a central aim of research employing the grounded theory approach. Another reason for my hesitation to both name the methods used here as a grounded theory, and indeed use those methods for much of the study, is that the most serious drawback of grounded theory explicated in its literature lies in its epistemological underpinning, which violates the epistemology of this study: Grounded Theory relies on the assumption of *the* reality as the subject of study, which 'rigorous' scientific method procedure can 'discover'. This assumption of 'the' reality not only misleads some authors like Glaser to the illusion of 'purely inductive' methodology (Glaser, 1992) but also allows a researcher little room to explore the margin of the text: As Sanger succinctly criticizes, "[a]ssumptions [underlying the coding procedure of Grounded Theory] that content means what it says exclude possible political or ideological assumptions that lie hidden in the margins of the text" (Sanger, 1995: 90).

Prior to data collection

A formal pilot study was not set up; rather I had informal conversations with several Korean-Canadian college students in order to "foreshadow" problems that would possibly arise during the study (Malinowski cited in Walcott, 1988). This provided me with some rough ideas of the physical boundaries of the Korean-Canadian community in Edmonton for which no written document is presently available. The students also described to me their own experiences of growing up in Canada. Most of those college students with whom I talked were, however, those that could be identified as "one point five generation"[8] Korean-Canadians, who I decided not to included as participants in this study[9].

---

[8] There is no clear definition for the "one-point-five generation", but it usually refers to Korean-Canadians who have actually experienced the process of "immigration" at a young, yet still mature enough age to remember something of that process, usually later than preschool age or around the age for beginning school.

[9] Although there is little substantial 'reason' for distinguishing one point five generation from second generation in terms of 'ethnic identity construction', especially in a study like this thesis, which attempts to avoid univocal generalization but to pay attention more to dynamic tensions in the subjects' narratives, I still wished to delimit the focus of the study to the 'second generation' who is presumed not to have experienced 'immigration' as their own status or as spatial and social transition. This does not imply that 'second generation' people do not experience any 'cultural transition'. Neither does it mean that 'immigration' produces a univocal experience, and nor do I endorse the notion that such an 'immigrant status' can be a reason for any social, economic, or political oppression and exclusion. However, if 'immigrant' status and experience create, to a certain degree, particular forms of social construction of reality -for example, the perception of oneself as 'immigrant' as well as addressing the representation of 'immigrants' by others , delimitation of the scope to the second generation, I believe allowed me to concentrate on the discourses of the second, and possibly the subsequent, generation of a 'visible ethnic minority' in Canada, who do not perceive themselves as 'immigrants', but are still labeled as 'hyphenated' Canadians.

Participants

The participants for the interview in this study are Canada-born second[10] generation Korean-Canadian adolescents in Edmonton. Access to the potential participants was sought through personal contact. Basically two paths for access to potential participants were taken: for individual interviews, there were five participants Jean (Grade 11; F), Andrew (Gr. 10; M), Linda (First Year College; F), Samantha (Gr. 12; F) and Sally (Gr. 8; F) obtained through personal contact and based on their willingness to participate. Along with conducting individual interviews with these five participants, I was also able to join a youth Bible study group[11] of one of the Korean churches[12] in Edmonton four times by the benevolent admission of the group leader. This gave me a chance to conduct two group interviews. After the group interviews, I asked two of the participants, Jeffrey (Gr. 11; M) and Stanley (Gr. 12; M) to volunteer for individual interviews, so there were a total of 7 individuals interviewed. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study as well as their right to change or withdraw the content of the interview. Oral consent was obtained from both participants and from the parents of participants under 18 years of age[13].

---

[10] There was one exception: In the group interview, one of the participants was a so-called one point five generation Korean-Canadian. However, his accounts were mainly used not as narratives under analysis but rather as reference accounts with which narratives of other participant were compared, contrasted and juxtaposed. In that sense, it is not quite correct to say all the participants were Canada-born second generation, but it is fair to say that the narratives that were analyzed were given by those participants as described and defined here.

[11] I feel responsible to make it clear that although I joined the group during the Bible study, the group activity itself was not under my study, and was not a source of data at all. The youth group meeting merely provided me with chances to contact adolescent Korean-Canadians, ask them to be participants for my study and to be familiar with those participants.

[12] As mentioned in the following section, internal variation in terms of backgrounds of participants was not taken into consideration in selection of interviewees. However, during the data collection I was concerned to make sure that I had both participants who go to Korean church and those who do not. Although there is no presumption that this may entail any difference on the issue of ethnic identity construction as I pose the questions, the reason I wished to have both Korean church goers and not-goers was partly because some studies (Min, 1991) document 'ethnic church' as a source of retention of 'ethnic identity' - or rather 'ethnic identification' - and partly because the conversation with young Korean-Canadians prior to the study revealed that 'the Korean church' is often mentioned in talking about their experience and life boundary. According to informal sources, more than 80% of Korean-Canadian families in Edmonton go to Korean churches. The population of people with Korean ethnic background is 2,275 according to the 1991 Canada Census, and is stated to be about 3,000 by a source in the Edmonton Korean Association, whereas the number of Korean churches in Edmonton, listed in the 1994 Edmonton Korean Community Directory, is eleven.

Procedures for Data collection

Data collection method

The formal data collection method was interviewing. The first interview was conducted exclusively in English (with the exception that some Korean traditions or names are mentioned in Korean during the interview) and with questions in an unstructured format; it was an attempt to figure out how the interview would work and also to develop beginning understandings which would lead to some ideas and questions for the next interview. The first group interview[14] was used for a similar purpose while it was also an opportunity to identify potential participants for individual interviews. All interviews except for the first individual interview were tape-recorded. All tape-recorded interviews, with the exception of one individual interview (Lisa's) and the first group interview[15], were fully transcribed word-by-word before the 'memoing' process was begun.

By the end of the data collection, each individual, with the exception of one, was interviewed once with the length of interview ranging from half an hour to an hour, and two of the individual interviewees also provided content as participants of the group interviews. Two interviewees, whose narratives were selected for more intensive analysis and presentation, were individually interviewed twice, although only for one of them was it done during the original data collection process. Both were revisited in order to clarify some issues raised in analysis of their (and others') first interviews, but one ("Andrew) was re-interviewed in the process of data collection while the other ("Stanley") was re-interviewed in the process of writing-up.

---

[13] For group interviews, consent was obtained from the adult leader of the youth group instead of parents of participants.

[14] The first group interview had too many participants (more than ten people) and it was difficulty to focus the discussion on topics relevant to my research. It was "ethically" not possible to reduce the number since the group was already formed prior to my interview and I could not arbitrarily exclude some members.

[15] Due to technical problems with the tape recorder, those two were not able to be fully transcribed. As these problems arose at the interview and it was obvious that no tape would be available for transcription, notes were taken during the interview and read over after the interview to see if other points needed to be added.

Sampling

The real subjects of this study are the narratives, the lived experiences, perceptions, and contradictions implicitly and explicitly expressed in the narratives, not the narrators *per se*. Although participants in this study are those who are still 'categorized' by a common denominator, that is, they are 'second generation Korean-Canadian', it should be emphasized that in this present study, category is significant not because it reflects 'common objective conditions' but because it creates a certain - and partial - structure of representation. As well, 'generalization' of results to that 'population' is far from the goals of this research.

Thus, a typical statistical sampling procedure with the concern of generalizibility (and thus, with the concern of internal variation) of the 'population' under study was not considered. Rather, 'samples' of the study are pieces of the narratives, and the 'sampling' procedure, if any, was concerned with the collection of the narratives - and particular aspects and focus of interests emerged from reading of the narratives - rather than the selection of the participants. The overall data collection process can be generally described as 'open sampling' in the sense that "openness rather than specificity guide[d] the sampling choices" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 176).

The interview questions which produced the narratives were developed and reformulated as each interview proceeded, by paying attention to the responses which are either "repeatedly present or notably absent" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 177) when each interview is compared with the others. Unlike 'theoretical sampling' in grounded theory, however, the interview questions were not purposively designed or intended in a way that can directly relate the responses to major themes and discussion of the presentation of the narratives; the questions were rather open to invite the narrators' accounts, and, when they became specific, they were intended to encourage the interviewees to find a point from which they could start their talk on the topic.

From the people who were interviewed, the narratives of two, Stanley and Andrew, were chosen as the selected narratives on which I would focus the analysis and my description of it in this text. Stanley's narrative was selected because he was in both an individual and group interview, and a very active respondent in both interviews, providing a lengthy narrative. Andrew's was selected to provide a different conceptual orientation to the question of ethnic identity, as his most clearly stood out from Stanley's when all the narratives were studied. Only the last interview with Stanley was conducted at the stage of in-depth analysis of the interview data when the research questions had already been refined and the direction of the interpretation had become more clearly focused, so that the interview questions in that interview were closely relevant to themes which had evolved.

After the initial analysis of all the collected interviews, I decided to treat the rest of the interviews collected as supplementary data for roughly picturing the communities - physical sites and life boundaries as well as for comparison of the selected narratives in order to capture the latter's 'peculiarities' as well as the 'commonalities' shared with the former. I decided to use some particular narratives for narrative presentation and extended discussions in this work and thus, as indicated above, only the narratives of two male narrators, who I have called Andrew and Stanley, were selected for more intensive reading and presentation. For interested readers, I have attached transcriptions of the interviews from two female participants as well as the group interview in the appendix.

Data analysis: Overall Procedure

The main 'technique' of data analysis for this research is memoing: unlike 'coding', which develops bits of data into categories of 'concepts' with their 'properties' and 'dimensional range' (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), memos, either in an analytical or free-flow form, allow the researcher to read the data as the language-in-context.

There were two phases of data analysis. The initial analysis was conducted using the transcriptions of all the collected interviews with equal amount of attention given to each interview. In this stage, I loosely categorized some aspects and identified points which constantly emerged across the interviews and cross-checked one against others while keeping a 'free-flow' memo for each narrator respectively. Along with this procedure, I constantly revisited the literature which allowed me to refine the research questions and focus of interest. Refined research questions led my interests to particular (selected) narratives, by focusing on which, I believe, the presentation of narrative, though at the expense of limiting the range of diversity of voices, can be organized in a way which facilitates a search for meanings and raises more meaningful questions.

Once I decided to re-read and re-present the selected narratives in relation to the refined research question, I re-approached these selected narratives as 'discourses' while using the rest of the interviews as the supplementary text with which I could compare, juxtapose or contrast the points addressed - or unsaid - in the selected narratives, and through which I could generate more questions. At this stage, I produced several 'analytical memos' in which more systematic contrast/comparisons were made to capture both common themes and contradictions in the accounts, and the relevant literature was interlaced into the narrative in order to generate further questions or to conceptualize the concrete expressions of the narratives into more global concerns and notions. The product of this latter stage of analysis is the core of this thesis, i.e. the text which I re-read and interpreted through the conceptual framework that I provided in the previous chapter and which I will present in the form of re-constructed narratives in the following chapters. The particular method of reading of the selected narratives is elaborated later in this chapter.

Reading & Re-presenting the narratives

With a Grounded Theory approach the phase up to the point of initial analysis would have been conducted in a primarily inductive manner, but my process of reading and re-constructing the selective narratives was taken up with an intensive interaction with the relevant text in a more reflexive way. This still can be seen a part of Grounded Theory procedure, namely the development of theoretical sensitivity yet, in my case, it was done with much greater intensity than authors on Grounded Theory may allow. In this path, *a priori* assumptions, which Grounded Theory warns a researcher to avoid, are seen as indispensible in exploring the social phenomenon which is layered by a multiplicity of reality: As "Weber could not imagine 'presuppositionless' gathering or interpretation of data" (Palys, 1990: 10), neither can I. Or as Palys puts it, "there is no such thing as immaculate perception" (Palys, 1990: 10).

Critical Ethnography

The method of reading and re-presenting the narratives can be defined as critical ethnography or ethnographic cultural criticism: it is still 'ethnography' in the sense that it brings forth the voices and lived-experience of the participants, yet, it necessarily requires 'critical' reading since those voices of lived-experience are not considered transparent. My understanding of lived-experience in this sense shares the premise put forward by Stuart Hall (1985), which, in turn, resembles the logic of identity in this study, that

> [i]t is in and through the systems of representation of culture that we "experience" the world: experience is the product of our codes of intelligibility, our schemas of interpretation, [thus] there is no experiencing outside of the categories of representation (105: emphasis in original)

This 'no experiencing outside of', however, should not be interpreted in a deterministic fashion since experiencing *inside* of the categories of representation can never be univocal: Nor does it mean that the subject is completely 'imprisoned' within these categories. Rather, this can be understood in the sense that by being narrated in a form of 're-telling', the lived-experiences are actually re-contructed as narratives in an 'intelligible' as well as 'meaningful' way from a present point of time and a particular perspective.

> The retelling of another's story is always a partial telling, bound not only by one's perspective but also by the exigencies of what can and cannot be told. The narratives of lived experience - the story, or what is told, and the discourse, or what it is that structures how a story is told - are always selective, partial, and in tension. (Britzman, 1991: 13)

On the other hand, ethnography, particularly in relation to writing about 'ethnicity' and 'culture', is identified by Fischer (1986: 232) as a writing strategy for cultural criticism which "operates dialectically among possible cultural and ethnic identifications". Such ethnography is "linked to our assessment of our own society as inequitably structured and dominated by a hegemonic culture that supresses a consideration and understanding of why things are the way they are and what must be done for things to be otherwise" (Simon&Dippo, in Britzman, 1991: 11).

In sum, what I pursue in conducting critical ethnography is, following Roger Simon and Donald Dippo's concern (1986), to theorize

> [h]ow people are implicated in the regulation and alteration of the terms of how they live together and how they define what is possible and desirable for themselves and others.... It is an interest organized by a standpoint which implicates us in moral questions about desirable forms of social relations and ways of living" (196, cited in Britzman, 1991: 11).

Hence, in this sense, the interest driving a work to critical ethnography is "both pedagogical and political" (ibid.: 11).

Tactics of Reading: Comparison, Contrasting, Contextualizing

At the stage of data analysis, some articles on 'methodology' or 'methods', which mainly address the issue of 'data collection', in fact, evoked some strategies directed towards reading the margin of the text. One of these was the strategy of 'confrontation' by actively and *intentionally* pressing the interviewee on an issue. The advantage of this strategy is well explained by Denscombe:

> The tactic of *challenging* the rhetoric of the 'representatives' in the research allows the researcher to probe beneath any superficial rhetoric and plausible fob-offs by actively questioning respondents in a mild form of adversarial exchange. An interview situation in which people have their positions challenged encourages them to provide not only a statement of their position on the topic but, more significantly in this context, a *justification* for their attitudes, experiences and beliefs as portrayed during the interview. In doing this they are called upon to justify their views by locating them within a broader set of meanings, motives and belief systems. (1995: 141)

'Confronting' issues in this fashion was not planned during the interview at all. However, it turned out that the central dynamics of the group interview evolved around the constant confrontations between two of the participants. Descombe (1995) points out the possibility that the challenges can come from the participants themselves as well, and it was this which happened in the group interview as may be seen in the whole text of that interview (Appendix A). This confrontational tactic was transformed to an analytical strategy of this work in a slightly different way; as the focus of attention was placed not so much on the justifications given by Stanley to other's confrontation but more on Stanley's own confrontation directed towards another participant.[16] If confrontations made by the researcher, as described by Descombe, reveals the researcher's intention and purposeful interest (thus, his/her own assumptions, commitment, and theoretical standpoint), Stanley's confrontations also can also be seen as a source from which one can capture *his* standpoint on the issues. And this way of reading led to an *intentional* re-writing of his narrative as explicated in the later part of the Narrative II.

Other Methodological Issues

"I" as an ethnographer

I am an ethnographer in this study, firstly because of the nature of the study for which I come into the field of interest with a set of loose assumptions and questions in order to pull out and gather the voices of the participants and seek to understand them initially 'emically'. Yet, my presence as an 'ethnographer' in this study is doubled because I have come from outside of Canada: I am a native born Korean and a foreign or international student whose understanding of Canada relies on substantive experience of it for a short period of time, specifically as a graduate student of a post secondary educational institute and thus a student member of an intellectual community for about two years. However, I would insist that the fact of being non-Canadian does not necessarily provide me with "the gaze of the tourist, bemused with a sense of bizarre cultural practices" (Silverman, 1989: 220) in Canada. Rather, and nonetheless, I may have the eye of a stranger to a great extent, which may make it more difficult for me to develop a well-contextualized, well-grounded understanding of the situation than a member of this society might do.

---

[16] When Denscombe discusses this confrontational tactic in his article, the discussion was focused more on its (positively) 'partisan' nature, which serves an 'emancipatory' goal of a committed researcher. By actively and intentionally engaging in conversations, the interview itself is not the mere collection of 'facts' but the process in which the 'intention' of the research is delivered by bringing in 'particular' theoretical perspectives. The purpose of the research from this perspective becomes not merely "interpretation of the world" but also "changing of it" as well (Denscombe, 1995). In a similar vein, but for different utility and with different forms, 'confrontations' became a focus of analysis in (re-)reading the ethnic consciousness of Stanley which he provided through interviews. Stanley was sometimes confronted by Eric and his justifications to Eric's confrontation revealed the ambivalence, confusion and contradictions in his own thoughts and remarks. Yet, more important or of more interest for this work was *his own* confrontation to Eric. Through his confrontations to Eric, what he actually did was attempted to clarify that his consciousness of his ethnicity *differs* from Eric's. Stanley's confrontations made it possible to contextualize the terms, remarks and statements he spoke in common languages within his broader understanding of the world, values, and concepts. This attempt can never be completed, however, since he speaks within the language system, which is already contaminated or limited by the social conventions of language usage.

As well, it can be said that I have came from a society where 'ethnic identity' completely overlaps 'national identity' and thus 'ethnicity' is neither a social nor political aspect of the internal affairs of the society, mattering only in the context of the global community. It can be argued that some individuals in Korea may still experience a certain meaningless of territorial boundaries in identity formations, and certainly some 'cultural identities' which are named other than 'ethnic identity' still matter in relation to 'national identity'. But overall, like an ethnographer from Canada or elsewhere in the west entering an unfamiliar society, the concept and associated practices of 'ethnicity' found in Canada are new to me and so I bring to them a "stranger's" capacity to look at them through new lenses.

Concerning my place in and knowledge of the 'community of Korean-Canadians in Edmonton', which is in a sense one of the most micro-level common denominators shared by my participants, I have both familiarity and unfamiliarity: On the one hand, the fact that I am familiar with the 70s 'culture' and social climate in Korea may enable me to roughly grasp what interviewees say, especially when they talk about their parents and first generation Korean-Canadians most of whom left Korea in the 70s. As well, since my arrival in Edmonton, I have been able to establish some personal relations with both some first generation Korean-Canadians and second (or one point five) generation youth. These relations have provided me with opportunities to visit their families, attend community events, and to hear and watch some aspects of their lives. On the other hand, apart from heterogeneities of personal history and experience among individuals, the specificities of 'migrant' life in general as well as some Canadian 'sub-cultures' (e.g. youth culture) and their physical sites have had a great degree of unfamiliarity to me, particularly until I embarked upon this study.

Trustworthiness

Research collaborators have been critical to my ability to carry out this work due to what I have explicated above. That is, I am not an insider both in the sense that I am not a native English speaker and I may not be familiar with Canadian society, youth culture, and contexts and experiences of Korean-Canadians. Thus I needed some ways to check my interpretations, particularly to make sure that my understanding of language in the particular contexts of the given narrative is correct and that I have not been significantly misled. To address this need, I invited as research collaborators some Canadian friends from both inside and outside my university department, including both non-Korean and Korean-Canadians. They provided me with advice and assistance both in transcribing the interviews and in understanding literal and figurative meanings of the accounts given in the narratives. I also checked with them to see if my interpretations 'made sense' providing them with both actual texts and my interpretations. This procedure for testing meaning and interpretation is a mixture of what traditional ethnography would call using 'key informants' in an unfamiliar society and grounded theory and other forms of qualitative analysis would call 'participant checks'; my notion of the assistance as 'research collaborators' fits with Patti Lather's (1991) methodological analysis.

Issue of 'rigor'

I reject the premise of the Grounded Theory (or any empirical study) that 'rigor' of the study can be established simply through 'rigor' of the scientific methods: this premise is based on the assumption that "[t]he scientific method seeks to test thought against reality in a disciplined manner with each step in the process made explicit" (Hoover, 1980: 36)[17], which in effect violates the epistemology held in this study. Although I have carefully described my 'method' or procedures above in ways which seek to display rigor, the primary way I have dealt with the issue of 'rigor' in this study relies on Sanger's suggestion that 'rigor' is established by leaving the readers space where they can exercise their own critical reading:

---

[17] Its underpinning epistemology - presumption of a single reality external to the knower - violates the theory of reality I hold for this thesis, which is basically that of a social constructionist.

> Research writing ... usually has the intentional quality of providing insight. This is done through interpretation. Here's the evidence. Here's the interpretation. What do you think? ... [When these two are conflated, the reader] is denied critical acts of analysis in testing evidence against insight. (Sanger, 1995: 5).

To establish rigor in that sense, I have tried to provide the actual texts of the data as often and in as lengthy a form as possible, and have included them in an appendix.

Limitation and Delimitation

Practical concerns

There was limitation in access to potential participants and consequently to possible narratives since participation of the subjects was based on personal contact and voluntarism. Thus, it should be noted that the participants in this study were those adolescents who were *accessible through* personal contact that was assisted by other *Korean-Canadian* s *and* who were *willing* to provide or describe their lived-experiences. This is important to note since the issue dealt with in this study is *ethnic* identity: some of my research collaborators as well as interviewees mentioned some second generation Korean-Canadian youth who are "ashamed of being Korean" (citing a research collaborator) or who will "deny" being Korean or "act like white" (Group Interview). Such people may 'suffer and be still' more than those who are 'willing' to talk, and because of my procedure for identifying people who would provide me with narratives, they are not people whose narratives I was able to gather.

What may be seen as more of a difficulty rather than a limitation, but also needs to be noted is that, unlike conversations with adults, those with youth seem to require more background knowledge on the contexts - i.e. language (jargon) and culture of youth, physical sites of everyday life, etc. As well, it is relatively true that youth are less articulate and eloquent in expressing their perspectives and ideas, which does not at all mean they have less perspectives and ideas. These factors contributed to my difficulty in gathering rich narrative for analysis, and interpreting the narratives gathered.

Theoretical delimitation

In identity formations, ethnicity or race is often complicated by other social categories, particularly gender and class. Although the focus of the study is not given to 'ethnic identity' as one dimension of individual cultural identities but rather to the limits and possibilities of particular discourses which evolve around ethnic identity construction, I also acknowledge that these two are not always separate but in a way interactive or overlapping. In this sense, my particular focus on 'ethnic' identity is not meant to reify the concept or see it as 'determining' in identity formation. However, both as a theoretical delimitation and a practical limitation, some possibly significant dimensions such as gender and class identity are not addressed in this study.

Summary and Restatement of the Research Question

Thus, the methodology for this study consists of a selection of a sample of narrative texts from interviews with second generation Korean-Canadian youth in Edmonton, and especially the narratives of two of the people interviewed. That text is then subjected to an analysis which relies partly on approaches presented in Grounded Theory and partly on approaches from Critical Ethnography. In particular, transcripts were analyzed through a 'memoing' process which enabled it to be treated contextually, and the analysis was shared with research collaborators with a more extensive experience in the Canadian setting than the researcher. As a result of this process, two narratives were selected for detailed presentation and explication.

This present study started with the broad question of "How is ethnic identity constructed among the second generation Korean-Canadian (in Edmonton?)?" As some of key notions related to ethnic identity construction were identified at the same time as the initial analysis of the interview data, the major research question became shaped as "How is identity among second generation Korean-Canadian youth constructed in the lived-experiences and ordinary discourses of the narrators with particular reference to notions of race, ethnicity, difference, culture and being 'Canadian'?"

In order to seek the answer to this broad question, the following detailed questions are asked in reading and interpreting the narratives which will be presented in the following two chapters. As well, the narratives in the next two chapters will be presented in a way so that some of specific questions that were raised in the introduction chapter can be addressed.

* How does the narrator represent or identify himself in relation to his ethnicity?

* What does such a form and content of ethnic identification mean - or how can it be read - when contextualized within the whole frame of the discourse of the narrative, which includes both the "said" and the "unsaid", nuances, contradictions and confusions found in both surface language and the structure of the narrative?

* How does the narrator place (locate) himself as well as his ethnicity in the broader context of Canadian society and multiculturalism and in relation to Others? Who are, if any, the significant Others in their ethnic identity construction?

* What are the specific dimensions of ethnic/racial dominance expressed in the discourse of the narrators, and what are the forms and contents of resistance, if any?

* What are the conformities and/or struggles that are enfolded within the narrator's lived-experience as related to ethnic identity?

* What are the contradictions in the narrator's discourse in selfhood, ethnicity, race/racism, citizenship, and culture? What are the physical sites of those contradictions?

Chapter Four

Narrative I : Andrew

Introduction

This chapter is a re-telling of the lived-experiences provided by Andrew.[18] In reading Andrew's narrative, particularly in comparison with the following narrative by Stanley (Narrative II), it should be noted that Andrew is a fifteen-year-old boy, who would say that he has never seriously thought about questions like 'who he is'[19]. Unlike some of the other interviewees who seemed to be expressing their 'denial' stage or confusion in defining themselves in relation to their ethnicity or 'ethnic' culture, Andrew says that he has not had such a period of time when he denied his ethnic heritage or struggled with the issue of identity:

> In elementary and junior high I didn't think of identity at all. I just thought of myself as a person and then in high school ... I would just say Korean-Canadian so I haven't really thought about it. [II: 10]

As a result, Andrew did not so much deliver or 'narrate' his personal history particularly on the matter of 'identity' as did Stanley (Narrative II) but rather responded to my indirect questions. The conversations with Andrew were centered around 'relationship' aspects in his life, both his relationship with his parents and with his friends. The focus of data reading was given over to exploration of multiple aspects and facets that seemed to be relevant to grasping the rough structure of his feelings and discourses on ethnicity and/or ethnic identity. The interview with him, as it unfolds with rather literal clarity, seems to tell us that on the one hand his sense of ethnic awareness, to a great degree, evolves around his emotional affiliation with his 'immigrant' parents as well as his 'visible minority' friends.

---

[18] As mentioned in the research procedure section, Andrew was interviewed twice. The second interview was the follow-up interview in which some of his remarks which had been made in the first interview were clarified, while other questions were introduced.

[19] It should be noted that Andrew is now experiencing some ' transition': as Andrew read this chapter, he expressed both that my accounts for his narratives hold validity in general and that the physical sites of his life boundary as well as his own thoughts on the issues raised in our previous conversations have changed a lot since the interview was conducted in May of 1995.

On the other hand, shifting the focus of interest from the aspects of emotional 'association' or 'affiliation' to the ways in which Andrew posits or positions himself and his 'ethnicity' in broader contexts and in relation to 'others' may enable us to notice tensions, ruptures and nuances created by collisions or intersection as well as fabrication by the multiple, yet, mutually relevant facets of constituting his self-hood, e.g. a particular ethnic identification (Korean), peculiarity of 'second-generation', being a 'visible minority' Canadian, and so on. This enabled me to gain a glimpse of the formation of his ethnic identity, which was neither articulated nor asserted but subliminally delivered by the ways he places himself and his ethnicity (Korean) in relation to significant Others. Although re-telling the given narrative in this section takes the 'thematic' rather than chronicle form of writing, 'themes' as such should not be taken as an attempt to reify the selective and particular aspects of the narrator's lived-experience but as metaphoric expressions of a particular reading given to the overlapping, related and/or fragmented dimensions of the complex identity formation process.

As a member of an 'Immigrant' Family

Andrew is a high school boy, who was born and brought up in Edmonton. The residential area in Edmonton where he grew up is known to have many relatively recent immigrants from Third World countries, that is, ' immigrant visible minorities'. Thus, it is sometimes rudely referred to as "Paki Land" because there are a number of residents whose ancestral background is East Indian (this mistaken linkage between the slang term, "Paki" and the people from India is also one of the common expressions of ignorance and racism). Andrew's parents had moved to Canada with their young children in the mid 70s as landed immigrants and then Andrew, the youngest of the family, was born when their life in Canada began to settle down. His family may be classified as urban middle class, but with a little bit of elaboration: his parents' job, despite the fact that they 'own' a small business, is identified by Andrew as "hard-working manual labor". Although the elaboration of 'hard-working parents' appears to be rather typical in most of the interviews, it was sensed that, particularly in the interview with Andrew, this is expressed more in terms of 'workers' or 'laborers', which may refer to 'status' in the society as well as 'hardship', and not merely in terms of 'good work ethic' (cf. Narrative II). Andrew describes his parents' job and life:

> The job they have right now, it's a good job, but it's too much manual labor. It's too demanding.[II: 2] My parents are mid-fifties, getting close to sixties, and they're lifting heavy things all the time and working manually all day. My dad sometimes works till two, three o'clock in the morning .... we're like good hard workers. [II: 2] I see my mom on Tuesday 'cause she gets a day off. But other than that, I see them in the morning before I go to school and they're sleeping anyway. And I see them at night right before I go down to bed when they come home from work [I: 7].

This 'hard work' of his parents may have influenced his relationship with his parents in various ways. As he points out, it has resulted in the scarcity of time[20] that Andrew can spend with his parents, which may in turn have contributed to a lack of communication, on the one hand. On the other, however, this may also have provided Andrew with some basis for developing his emotional affiliation with, respect for and affirmation of his parents as well as their values. Andrew speaks Korean a little, comprehending better than speaking, yet he does not speak enough to effectively communicate with his parents, who - especially his mother - speak English but not enough to converse with Andrew about detailed and delicate matters. In common with the accounts of the other interviewees, a language barrier - perhaps as well as a generation/value gap - prevails in the relationship between Andrew and his parents so that they "always miscommunicate with each other". Yet, despite this 'miscommunication', Andrew expresses the opinion that he 'understands' his parents by and large. And, in what he says, this 'understanding' has particular references to the status (quality) of his parent's job, which he thinks may have resulted in their emphasis on education:

> [T]here's a lot more emphasis on education for Korean families than for white families.... [W]ith 50's and 60's [referring to school grades], basically you can get your high school diploma and you won't get anywhere. But for my parents, it's like 'we don't care as

---

[20] This scarcity of leisure time that Korean immigrant parents can spend with their children is also documented in a study on mother tongue acquisition among Korean-Canadian children in Edmonton (see, Seif, 1984).

> long as you graduate from university', so .... I think why my parents stress education so much (is) because ....they don't want us to have to do that [labor] from ten to twelve o'clock in the morning everyday like they do. [II: 2]

Since Andrew now 'understands' what his parents want him to do and why, their 'strictness', which is often complained about by second generation Korean-Canadian youth, is accepted as 'reasonable' by him:

> It's not like my parents haven't done anything for me, so they do so much for us, we should at least make them happy by studying and achieving well. [II: 3]

In his attempt to understand the hardship that his 'immigrant' parents did and do have in this 'host' land, Andrew may somehow share - at least emotionally - that 'immigrant' status with them. Or, putting it differently, Andrew is still a member of an 'immigrant' family, although he himself is not an 'immigrant'.

'Korean' as a positive self-identification

Parents may be Andrew's only, and an indirect, experience of 'Koreanness' other than the 'Korean-Canadianness' of his second generation Korean-Canadian friends. For Andrew, a second generation Korean-Canadian, Korea is his parents' homeland, not his own. His only experience of 'native Korea' is his family's visit to Korea when he was five, about which he is not able to recall any clear memories except some 'rats' he found in his relative's house.

Andrew has gone to Korean weekend language school for three or four years to find that he learned "only how to read and write" in such ineffective ways that, even when he read, "[he did] not understand what [he was] reading": as Andrew explains, his Korean language acquisition is minimal for basic communication. What Andrew can identify as Korean 'culture' or tradition - or Korean tradition that his family is practicing at home - is limited not only in its range but also in his understanding of their substantial meanings underlying the forms or artifacts. Unlike some other Korean-Canadian adolescents in Edmonton, who occasionally go to one of the Korean churches and join a youth group, Andrew is not engaging in any organized 'ethnic' activities or social gatherings. He is not interested in nor does he try to seek entertainment of popular culture 'imported' from Korea, which some groups of Korean-Canadian youth these days may find "cool" or "trendy".

However, while Andrew has little knowledge of 'Korean' traditions, speaks little Korean, faces difficulty in communication with his 'Korean' parents due to both a language barrier and time scarcity, gets involved in no institutional 'ethnic' associations such as youth groups of Korean churches, and is hardly interested in seeking 'ethnic' artifacts or 'culture', his ethnic identification is strongly and positively expressed in his narrative in various ways. One of them is his affirmation of Korean 'culture', however he understands it. That is, the expression of his self-identification as being Korean may be found in his statements expressing his positive image of Korean 'culture' and tradition, which are basically represented by his parents' values, and his sharing such values with his parents to some extent.

Andrew's understanding of positive Korean values as he explicates, is particularly limited to the emphasis on educational performance. Yet, one of the main reasons presented by him for why he conforms with his parents' also shows that he shares with his parents other values like family-oriented attitudes and respect for the elders. This affirmation, as pointed out above, seems to come from Andrew's sympathetic understanding with his hard-working 'immigrant' parents. And, for Andrew, 'Korea' or 'Koreanness' is represented by his parents, particularly the values and customs that they practice in the upbringing of their children.

Hence, his affirmation of his parents, in a way, also means his affirmation of Korean 'culture'. Although 'valuing education' is merely one dimension of Andrew's understanding of Korean culture, his reference to it seems to show how in general he feels about the 'Koreanness' of his family as well as other Korean families. This aspect of Korean 'culture' or tradition is also one of the most saliently 'different' features of Korean families that Andrew can articulate:

> I can notice [differences in the ways in which families run] the most in schooling, and what a white family thinks of marks and what a Korean family thinks of marks. Most of the white parents I know are very happy if their kids pass or get 60. But, for a Korean family, anything under 80 is a fail. So I think there's a lot more emphasis on education for Korean families than for white families [II: 1]

Asked about his ideas on this matter, he kept expressing the viewpoint that he thinks "it's better the way Korean families run" and even accepting Korean parents' strictness as fair and reasonable, which is often complained about by other Korean-Canadian youth. This in turn may be read as his positive self-identification of being Korean. In this way, 'Korean (ethnic)', thus, 'different' family, which is often identified as a source of agony, trouble, and self-denial by some Korean-Canadian youth, appears to be positively accepted by Andrew.

Ethnic identity as 'visible minority' identity: "I'm just Korean anyway"

Although Andrew could not articulate specific differences between his 'white' friends and himself other than 'family' and 'experiences of racism', he seems to believe that his 'difference' is salient enough to hinder him from getting along well with a white clique. Those two features of his 'different experience' - family and racism - are identified as being significant enough for him to feel "left out" from 'white' cliques that he used to hang around with most of time before his 'clique' turned out to be "all colored" at the end of junior high school.

Another aspect that is often found in Andrew's account is that, when he tries to explain, for instance, 'difference' in family feature which is peculiar to Koreans, what he actually identifies is the difference between a 'white' family and 'ethnic minority' or 'non-white' family as he understands and perceives those differences within his life boundary and from his peers. Although the specificities may vary, Andrew seems to still see - or to refer in some way to- commonalities in family structure that all his 'colored' friends share, and to want to positively evaluate them.

In a sense, 'Korean' seems to be referred to often without clear distinction between 'Korean' and 'ethnic minority'. Then, whatever is referred to as 'Korean' in that sense is not only far from whatever is 'native Korean' but also can be interpreted as more than a particular ethnic reference. Self-representation or identification in this sense cannot be discussed outside the context of 'to whom the narrator represents himself'.

As pointed out earlier, whereas some of the other interviewees express a 'denial' stage or confusion in defining themselves in relation to their ethnicity or 'ethnic' culture, Andrew says that he has not had such a period of time, when he denied his ethnic heritage or struggled with the issue of identity;

> In elementary and junior high I didn't think of identity at all. I just thought of myself as a person and then in high school ... I would

> just say Korean-Canadian so I haven't really thought about it. [II: 10]

This identity as being just a person or just Korean-Canadian is what he represents his selfhood to himself: as he reflects on himself, he can be a person - Andrew, Canadian, Korean, Korean-Canadian, and so on. However, his identification, once contextualized and reshaped in relation to the people to whom he is represented, becomes more complex. Although he considers himself just as Korean-Canadian, he would say "if I was to move back to Korea right now they'd just think that I'm like basically white like a Canadian". Then, in the Canadian context, he sees himself to be "more Korean". That Andrew identifies himself to be "more Korean" may be elaborated in two ways. On the one hand, as it expresses his ethnic identification, it is important to know what it means to him to be Korean. While he 'believes' that he must have been raised in a 'Korean' way and, and thus may have been embedded in Korean culture, for him 'to be Korean' basically indicates his ancestry:

> Basically [it] just means [to be Korean to me] that ... my parents are Korean so I'm Korean. That's basically all it means to me. And maybe you're raised different too because my parents weren't born here and they raised me more like a Korean person than a ... normal ... like ... if people were to live here all their lives and raise their kids differently than how my parents raised me. [I: 3]

In this context of his thought, his self-identification of being Korean appears to be rather unambiguous (with little confusion or denial) in his accounts. On the other hand, the questions that can be raised are "In what context is it that he identifies himself to be 'more Korean'? And, 'more' Korean than 'what'?" Answers to these questions seem to me to present a partial, yet, significant picture of the context in which "'ethnicity' comes to matter" to Andrew. He thinks of himself as "more Korean" and he presents his 'Korean' upbringing as one of the reasons why he thinks so. Yet, this expression of "more Korean" seems to me to need more scrutiny in relation to his other accounts. This is one of the aspects through which the face value of Andrew's 'ethnic' assertion and his expressed positive image of his cultural heritage are brought into another angle of interpretation, which is particularly focused on his reference to the notion of ethnic minority, cultural diversity, race, and 'Canadian'.

In the initial part of the first interview, I asked a question which I believed would evoke ways in which people place themselves in relation to their ethnicity:

> I(interviewer): Have you ever been asked where you are from?
>
> A(Andrew): Yeah, all the time. "What are you?", "Are you Chinese?"
>
> I: How do you respond then?
>
> A: I just say, "No. I'm Korean" and I just leave it at that.
>
> I: You don't explain further? Like, I was born here, I'm a Korean-Canadian,[21] etc.?
>
> A: Even if I say "Korean-Canadian", it doesn't matter.
>
> I: Why is it so?
>
> A: 'Cause then I'm just Korean anyway. 'Cause even if I was born here, so basically I'm more ... even though ... *you can see that I'm not white*. But, since I was born here, even then, *I'm still more Korean. At least to them I am.*

While Andrew's identification with being Korean in the context of his positive evaluation and acceptance of his 'culture' or heritage may be read as his strong association with or assertion of a particular identity - i.e. "being Korean", this particularity of identity in the context of self-representation to the Other seems to recede into the background. Rather, his mentioning and in fact juxtaposing 'white' with being Korean in his narrative is so persistent that his saying "I am Korean anyway", seems to have the resonance of repeating 'you see I am not white'. Re-reading his assertion that he is Korean in this way, it seems to me to sound more than just ethnic identification of being 'Korean'; rather to me, it sounds like 'I am an (ethnic) minority'.

In other words, the sense of 'ethnic' self that may be read in Andrew's narrative cannot be fully exhausted by his sense of being 'Korean'; his sense of 'ethnic' self seems to go beyond his identification as Korean. Rather, it seems to indicate how he locates himself; his location as a visible minority in the Canadian society and in relation to a "non-ethnic" majority. Thus, as long as he is *not white*, what matters more is not how he identifies himself but how he is identified by Others: even though he claimed that he was born here in Canada, he would still be 'more Korean', or "at least *to them*" he is. In a way, Andrew's response as such (or the way he puts it) shows some parallel with how he has been recognized and treated by others. To the question whether he has experienced any negative or embarrassing moment in relation to his being visible minority, he recalls:

---

[21] In fact, one research collaborator pointed out to me that this question seems nonsensical since to her, asking someone in Canada, the question of 'where are you from' in Canada meant to refer to ethnic origin. Hence, she felt that people, regardless of 'ethnic visibility', would respond to their ethnic origin. People would only respond to 'I am Canadian' if they were asked this question outside Canada. This advice seems to be reasonable. However, my intention in posing that particular question in that way was to see how the interviewee responds to it and how he elaborates his answer since I thought it would be both interesting and important how - in what way, with what kind of 'expression' and with what degree and type of emotional sensitivity-one responds to this question to identify one's ethnic ancestry by other fellow Canadians.

> Basically, like, all people I know do. It happens like, all the time, like ... not all the time, but it used to, like, in elementary and junior high, we'd be walking around and you'd hear people yelling ... 'You stupid Chink'. [I: 2]

To my following, perhaps not so appropriate, comment that people might think he was Chinese, he says: "Yeah. Cause *to them* we're either a Chink or a Nip. So it doesn't matter. They just use any one of these. Or, a FOB[22]., or anything". [I: 2] What seems to be interesting here is not such an experience *per se* - the experience that may be shared in common among most 'visible minority' children in their childhood - but the way such an experience is inscribed in and expressed by the narrator. In a way, what Andrew expresses may be interpreted as his way of dealing with the incidents in which he has been 'positioned as Other on *their* terms not his, yet inescapably unable to refuse that positioning.'[23] This experience of being called by racial slang terms may have not only informed him that he is a 'visible' minority but also made him realize how little power he holds over racism as such. To my question how he would respond to such incidents, he answers:

> Well ... nothing. What am I supposed to do? Usually they're, like, with their friends, but I'm alone or something. There's nothing you can really do in a situation like that. [I: 2]

---

[22] F. O. B. stands for Fresh-Off-the-Boat.

[23] This expression is borrowed with some modification from Roger Simon (1987: 41) where he talks about his own experience of being called in 'ethnic' slang or with ethnically associated swear words.

Thus, as he has repeatedly encountered racism as such while he realized he had little control over it, Andrew has developed a kind of 'insensitivity' towards racism in order to cope with it.

> [How did I feel about it?] I don't know. The first few times you get mad, but, then after you just, like, learn to deal with it. Cause it happens to you so much, you kind of get used to it. It doesn't really bother me as much then cause, you know, they're, you know, ignorant. [I: 2]

Although Andrew says "now it doesn't bother me so much", his description of racism is far more vivid in his narrative than those given by the rest of the interviewees, revealing that his experience of racism is not only present in his memory but deeply embedded with an emotional overlay .

> I didn't start noticing it until, like that .... the racism and everything, you know, in school and everything. Just outside of school. I didn't even notice it. When I got older I started noticing it more. [I: 6]
>
> In elementary I wouldn't notice in school because I was friends with white people too. But outside of school you'd find like the older kids when I'm walking to my friend's house they'd come up to me and start swearing at me, "you stupid Nip" and all that. Outside of school you just notice it more. [II: 3]

Along with the same experience of having a "different family", the same " experience of racism" is what he says enables him to relate more with visible minority friends than with Koreans per se. While this rather concrete form of individual experiences of being 'visible' becomes a source for Andrew's affiliation with his other 'visible minority' friends, his affiliation with them, in turn, seems to provide him with a continuous reminder of racism (and perhaps a source that shapes his perception of the world). Somewhere in his narrative, he is even able to provide a vivid description of racism not only of his own experience but of his friends. As the conversation led from his 'portrayal' of white people and to my subsequent question about ideas of his other 'non-white' friends on this, Andrew says:

> There's a couple of my East Indian friends that totally hate white people. They can't stand them, I know. And, not just because ... one of my friends came here when he was in grade 6 and when he came here, uh, the white people used to chase him and throw him

> into garbage cans because he's .. uh ... not a very big guy either. He's, maybe, I think he's maybe 5' 3" in height and he's really scrawny and small. Short and small. So ... he just can't stand them, just the way they used to treat him. [I: 5]

'White' imagery reflected on 'visible minority' self-image

Andrew's sense of being a 'visible minority' seems not only to be manifested through his emotional affiliation with other visible minority friends but also reinforced through the counter-imagery of white Others reflected on his 'visible minority' self. As well, the boundary of his everyday contact and interaction with concrete individuals seems to also reflect this organization of the social world into 'white others' and 'visible minorities'. The physical boundary of his interpersonal experience may have been either chosen by him or proposed to him, or, perhaps in most cases, both. On the other hand, the boundary of the 'given' possibility within which he may conduct his action and reshape his lived-experience, may be constantly reproduced and produced through the composition of his peer group and their experiences. When the clique he hangs around with came into focus, he identified that his present friends have diverse ancestral backgrounds - mainly Korean, Chinese, and East Indian, but no 'white' at all: Basically, all are 'colored', in the Canadian context 'visible minorities'.

> I haven't hung around with white guys since grade seven. I don't know ... in grade seven, I came into junior high and only had white friends just cuz in my elementary, there was only two Koreans, me and another girl. So basically all my friends were white. But, by the end of junior high, I had, like, few white friends and the rest were all colored. And now it's just all colored. [II: 6]

The detailed process of such a formation of 'cliques' was not given in his account: he "can't explain what happened" but "it's just the way it turned out" [II: 6] . While implying that such a particular pattern of 'clique' was 'given' to him rather than 'pursued' by him, Andrew nevertheless expresses a possible reason for it:

> I think when I hang around with white friends, I feel left out. Just because I can't relate to them as much as I can relate to other bands [groups], visible minority, because most of them have a lot of the same ... like, same experiences of racism and most of them, their families are more like mine. They were raised more like me. So I

> can relate to them more...like, understand what's going on and the stuff. [II: 6]

Although there are clearly physical sites that may have provided him with concrete experiences, however, experience as the guiding structure for our action possibilities or as creating another set of perception does not spring from a vacuum: it is mediated and interpreted through constantly sustaining and/or changing perception. While developing a certain degree of emotional 'peoplehood' or ethnic/racial affiliation can be produced and reproduced through actual experience of concrete interactions and feelings in daily life, there also seems to be a strong binary image of 'white' as opposed to 'visible minority' playing a role in this experience. Interestingly, this imagery of 'whites' seems to often be reflected as 'imagery' that lacks 'peoplehood'. Once Andrew identified that he has virtually no white friends, I wanted to determine whether or not that meant no interpersonal relationships with 'whites' at all.

> Well, this one person but I'm not really friends with him. I just talk to him sometimes. They're nice guys so.... Then, rest of them .... yeah, they're fine. There's like two kinds of white people I think. There's one kind who only likes white people and wants to hang out with white people. And so every now and then you find a lot of them, like if you go out or something. And then, there's another kind who, to them, it doesn't matter like what color you are or anything. They'll be nice to you if you're nice to them. And I've only met two or three that I could say, 'they're nice to me, I'm nice to them' that kind of thing in our school. [I: 5]

In Andrew's narrative, one of the things that puzzles me is the fact that in his description, 'white' people hardly appear to be 'neighboring' individuals. His perception of 'white' people may have been gleaned from his own experiences of everyday contact through a long period of time, yet, experience itself seems to be reconstructed through the prism of 'image' as well. Also, it can be once again sensed that Andrew's attitude to 'white' is often reactive rather than 'active'. In that sense, on the opposite side of the coin whose one side is painted with a strong sense of self as a 'visible minority', is the image of 'white' people reflected and constructed in experience and discourse, in equally strong terms as a homogenous 'other'.

The image of 'white' in Andrew's perception seems to be associated with 'racism'. He also perceives racism to be present "everywhere, all the time" and "it's getting worse". Although Andrew also points out that "racism in general is getting worse" because "everyone, not just the white people hate... hating us, but colored people hating white people and colored people hating colored people" [I: 7], the racist image has a particular association with white people. This is sometimes read in the way he makes remarks. To my question asking about 'ethnic' or 'racial' cliques in his school, he describes school thus:

> Oh, yeah, Oriental people hang around together and Black people hang around together. Yeah, it's the same everywhere because even in my school, Black people hang around together, and the Brown people hang around together, and me and my friends hang around with the Brown people. I don't know (why) just more because we can relate to them more and ... the white people in my school are really racist [II: 4].

In a way, Andrew's remark that the white people in his school are really racist is confusing since he keeps saying that he does not find a lot of racism inside school but rather outside of school. Yet, it seems to make sense if I understand it as meaning that, while the kind of racism he says to be rare in school refers to overt racism such as the incidents he was able to describe in detail, it seems that he also believes that the white people in his school are racist in the same sense as Andrew describes the negative type of white people. For him, they still appear to be racists in that sense although they do not express it to him as other white people outside school would do by calling him racial terms: Since "[he] hangs out with a big crowd [in school], so no one really says anything" [I: 6].

Racism seems to linger in Andrew's mind so that he even added another remark on it when we had just finished talking about 'culture' and when no specific question was asked or no particularly racism related issue had been raised.

> A: I think Alberta is supposed to be one of the most racist provinces.
>
> I: Really?
>
> A: Didn't you see that thing on ITV, 100% Redneck? They were doing this thing on rednecks and it seemed that most Albertans were proud to be rednecks and the stuff, or that's what it seemed like to me. [II: 8]

I suspect that each group constructs this image of 'the other' without reflection, and related to the construction hostility can be escalated confirming and strengthening the beliefs and the patterns of behavior. However, in national and political terms, the difference between Andrew's imagery construction of the Otherness of the 'white' and whites' construction of Otherness of the 'ethnic' is that for Andrew, 'white' represents 'Canada' whilst 'ethnic' represents 'marginalization'. Even his sense of ethnic identity reflects this representation of 'ethnic' Other whose diversity is marginalized. Thus, his idea is ambivalent.

'Ethnic', Canada, and Multi-cultures

> ... [W]e can read ourselves against another people's pattern, but since it is not ours ... we emerge as its effects, its errata, its counter-narratives. Whenever we try to narrate ourselves, we appear as dislocations in their discourse. (Said, 1986, in Ferguson, 1990)

Although Andrew expresses a positive attitude towards his parents as mentioned earlier, it seems that there is always a sense of 'displacement' in his narrative. While some of interviewees express conflicts, which they have experienced as a young child between the culture of other kids and cultural practices at home, in terms of a desire for 'fitting in' which entails 'denial' of their heritage, Andrew does not explicitly address this. Yet, in his narrative, his emphasis on 'difference', which his parents may have practiced in his upbringing, seems to show the shadow that he had to carry of his feeling of being displaced from the culture of other kids. As quoted earlier, Andrew says: "maybe you're raised different too because my parents weren't born here and they raised me more like a Korean person than a ... normal ... like ... if people were to live here all their lives and raise their kids differently than how my parents raised me". [I: 3] After the first interview, I read the term, 'normal' and wanted to clarify it with him in the second interview.

> I: I was just wondering what you meant by 'normal' here? What do you think 'normal' family upbringing is?
>
> A: Not really normal. Just really different. Different than any other family that wasn't Korean. Because you could see all the differences in how a Korean family is run and how a white family is run here.

Interestingly, even after he replaced 'normal' with 'just really different than any other family that wasn't Korean', his reference point with which his 'different' family was compared was still a 'white' family. Yet, as pointed out earlier, Andrew does not negatively evaluate this 'difference'. Quite the contrary, by asserting that he is Korean and positively evaluating Korean 'culture', however he understands it, Andrew demonstrates his positive acceptance of 'difference' as such. As well, through affiliation with all 'colored' friends, he asserts his identity as an ethnic minority. On the other hand, however, his individual positive representation of his particular 'ethnic' as well as racial identification seems not to be completely independently developed since being 'ethnic' does not merely refer to a 'neutral' description of people but connotes an already asymmetrically charged social position. This seems to lead to Andrew's remarks on ethnicity always being ambivalent. In spite of his positive evaluation, being 'ethnic' or 'visible minority' as expressed in his narrative seems not to be an 'empowering' status. As discussion touched the issue of multiculturalism and of what it means to be 'Canadian', this ambivalence seems to emerge to the surface.

> I: What is multiculturalism as you understand it?
>
> A: It's just ... like, even with like, with Canada ... it's just ... many cultures, like living together and interacting cuz in other countries you won't find as many cultures as in Canada. Even if you look in a classroom, you'll see that it is very multicultural because sometimes there will be more visible minorities than white people.
>
> I: It's very multicultural because you have many minority people? Then, what about White People? Or, British, or say, Anglo-Saxon or European people? Don't they also have cultures? How do you see those people's cultures?
>
> A: I'm not sure, I just see them as Canadians. [II: 7] ....
>
> I: What is Canadian culture, then? Can you identify what Canadian culture is?
>
> A: Not really. I could just ... the only way you could really describe it is like if you go to the States you'll notice the difference like even the slang, how we speak. Like, it's the same language but the people in North America, the US ... it's English but we'll have different variations of speaking it.[II: 9]

Interestingly in this context, Andrew places himself as 'Canadian', as different from the people of the US who speak "the same language....but with different variations of speaking it". But for the most part in his narratives, Andrew's sense of being 'different' always places 'white' as a reference point with which such 'difference' is measured. This does not necessarily mean that Andrew 'thinks' that white is a reference point with which every difference should be measured: he seemed not to be fully aware of what he said and neither had I been until, after a few readings of his narrative, I found that 'white' constantly appeared whenever 'difference' in Canada was talked about. Then, from Andrew's remarks on multi-cultural Canada, I felt that 'white' not only appears as a reference point for comparing differences but also becomes the 'norm' by displacing itself from 'difference' or 'diversity'. Once again, this does not mean that Andrew *thinks* that "white" is a norm. This merely means that in Andrew's eyes, 'white' (or 'British' or 'European' if you wish) as opposed to 'visible minority' does not have a visible color which belongs to the world of 'diversity' or 'multi-culturalism'.

While asserting that 'white is a color!', Leslie Roman (1993) speaks to this same notion of a 'norm', pointing out how such 'invisibility' enables whiteness to displace itself from the discourse of 'diversity' and thus become a hidden norm.

> [G]iven the tendency of the multicultural discourse to celebrate diversity without adequately analyzing power differentials among groups positioned by racial categorizations and inequalities, the phrase "people of color" [and, in the Canadian context, what is often called ethnic minorities and their multi-cultures] still implies that white culture is the *hidden norm* against which all other racially subordinate groups' so-called "differences" are measured. Within certain contexts, the phrase can convey the mistaken idea that racially subordinate groups are essential subjects of a single experience or system of racism. At the same time, it can be used to imply that whites are *colorless*, and hence without racial subjectivities, interests, and privileges. Still worse, it can convey the idea that whites are free of the responsibility to challenge racism. (Roman, 1993: 71)

In this sense, then, it could be argued that through unquestionable acceptance of the notion of 'ethnic' and/or 'minority' represented by the mainstream culture and its marginalization while unconsciously placing 'white' in the center, Andrew's strong assertion of ethnic/racial identification seems to fail to be 'empowering', in spite of his gesture of resistance to racist name calling (I'm Korean anyway/refusing to 'defend'): it seems to me to be rather 'disempowering'. No matter how scholarly studies[24] or official multiculturalism defines ethnicity, to Andrew whiteness or Euro-ethnic is not 'ethnic'. In effect his perception as such is not so much different from the way that ethnic diversity and multiculturalism is discussed in this country. But I think it suggests that it may be that rather than de-racializing the cultural debate in Canada white should be racialized or ethnicitized. White is certainly absent in popular notions of multiculturalism or common-sensical definition/lay meaning of 'ethnicity'. By displacing itself from 'diversity', whiteness becomes the 'center' from which 'diversity' becomes 'marginalized'. And, as this center is also seen as the 'universal Canadian', Andrew's 'particular Canadian' is also marginalized.

Hence, even though he may be seen by native Koreans to be "basically white like a Canadian"[25], Andrew will still be 'more Korean' than 'Canadian' in white Canada: Andrew frequently expresses that he is 'different' *and* Korean, and 'any other than Korean' often implicitly and explicitly refers to 'white' whose culture is in turn perceived as 'Canadian'. In this context, I asked him whether he would eventually feel that he is 'a real Canadian' whatever it means to him:

> A: Well, I guess I could but I'll always sort of be, like not really. Like I could partially, like, just like a job [we previously talked about getting a job and becoming an adult member of society] and stuff but just the way I think and stuff is not the same [as other Canadians]. I may not be able to ... not completely.
>
> I: Well, you are a Canadian citizen.
>
> A: Yeah. Cuz I was born here and lived here all my life. You can't help but feel kind of Canadian. But then again I feel really Korean too.

What is more at stake (in Andrew's narrative) seems to be his ambivalent and somewhat incompatible ideas between 'I appreciate my being Korean' and 'I am an ethnic minority (which means I belong to that group which composes 'diversity'). Diversity is something other than 'Canadian'. Thus, 'I cannot help feeling Canadian', but 'I cannot be a true Canadian as long as I know that I am 'more Korean' (or at least to them I am Korean).'

---

[24] Such scholarly studies define ethnicity as all ancestral roots including European (e.g., Breton et al., 1990; Fleras and Elliott, 1992).

[25] When talking about his (native) Korean relatives, he said "If I was to move back to Korea right now they'd just think that I'm like basically white like a Canadian".

Ethnicity and Invisible Center

'Ethnic identity' in Canadian society is often dealt with, without question, as if it is one of the 'sub-' identities of individual Canadian citizens, which is subjugated under "Canadian" (national/broader) identity, on the one hand, and, on the other, which encompasses broader community identity or group identification through which individuals express or assert) their 'belonging'/'people-hood' (e.g. Fleras & Elliott, 1992). It appears to be common-sense that there is a 'Canadian' identity which is not ethnic (particular) but national (universal). However, it is interesting to notice that some interviewees such as Andrew seem to hold the two different concepts - though vague and ill articulated - of "Canadian", one that is of "Canadian" (nationality or citizenship) as opposed to other countries and the other that is "Canadian" (White) vis à vis "ethnic". For the latter, the notion of 'Canadian' *excludes* 'ethnic' as one side of a binary dichotomy rather than *emcompasses* it as a part of the whole.

In general, "ethnic consciousness" - whether constructed as in the case of Andrew, or (relatively more) intentionally chosen as in the case of Stanley to be presented in the next chapter - indicates that a particular ethnicity does not stand vis à vis the diverse other ethnicities; it stands as one side of a binary dichotomy between one's ethnicity (Korean) and "the other" white (Canadian). Particularly to those Canada born subsequent generation of immigrants, the issue of ethnicity tends often to be racialized: it is not so much a particular ethnic identity (to be Korean), which can imply that the rest is 'diverse' and 'to be Korean' is one of such 'diversity'; rather what comes to 'matter' is the identity of being 'ethnic' within still racially unjust Canadian multi-culturalism, which presents the invisible centre as being 'non-ethnic'. This 'being ethnic' can only exist within an unspoken 'non-ethnic', 'invisible white ethnicity'.

Because of Canadian multiculturalism, ethnic identity (or ethnicity) in Canada is generally viewed or studied with little attention to the aspect of the racialization of ethnic identity. There is a certain gap or rupture between the official or sociological categorization of ethnicity and the construction of ethnic identity in everyday life and discourse. When education (especially anti-racist or multicultural education) is seen as intentional intervention to the mental processes (consciousness/unconsciousness) of individuals, it seems not to be enough for anti-racist or multicultural pedagogy to rely on sociological macro-studies of ethnic identity based on 'ethnic categories' for 'ethnic identity' escapes beyond ethnic categories. On the other hand, a psychological approach to ethnic identity as one dimension of individual cultural identities or 'situated' identity seems not to capture the dialectic between structure and subjectivity in identity construction.

As mentioned earlier, Andrew is a boy who would say 'I am too young to think about who I am'. He also says that he has not struggled with his identity of being Korean or 'Korean-' Canadian. Since his father speaks English a little and his mother speaks "close to none", Andrew tries to speak Korean to his parents at home; however, communication that can be achieved is minimal not only because of a language barrier or value differences but also because of little time to converse with each other.

On the one hand, his sense of being 'Korean' seems to evolve mostly around his emotional affiliation with and affection for his parents, and not to be much 'materialized' by 'practicing' traditions or by consciously pursuing 'being Korean'. On the other hand, however, maybe as a result of 'situated learning' (Lave and Wenger, 1991) in his family and through his related 'conformity to' if not 'affirming of' his parents' value and will, Andrew presents himself as being Korean in a way that makes it appear to be natural and taken-for-granted. Of course, it is a 'taken-for-granted' fact since according to the definition given it by Andrew, to be Korean means just that "[his] parents are Korean so [he is] Korean". But, he also thinks that "[he is] raised different too [I: 3] " and "the way I think and stuff is not the same[II: 4]

Thus, it seems to me to be necessary to think about Andrew's so persistent - compared with other interviewees - placement of himself more in the context of family ['Korean'] than in the context of society ['Canada'], or putting it differently, more as a response to the question of 'where he is from' than 'where he is at'[26].

---

[26] For the second generation Korean-Canadian, as a 'hyphenated' Canadian and a child of immigrant and 'visible minority' parents- or in a 'critical diasporic' sense - the question of 'where you are at' already presumes the question of 'where you are from' or vice versa, in the sense that both questions signify the positionality of the subjects in the social and political

My personal impression driven from my reading Andrew's narrative was that for the second and subsequent generations of visible minority, "Canada" is definitely their 'home' (their citizenship is supposed to dictate their ownership (in terms of political right) of that homeland), yet, for some, a certain 'particular' (mainstream) Canada represents this 'universal' Canada, in which their 'particular' Canada ('diversity' that belongs only to visible ethnic minorities) is seen as 'not Canada'. In this version of diversity and 'multicultural' Canada, one is trapped in the dilemma that "you *either* repudiate 'where you are from' for 'where you are at' *or* pay for 'where you are from' at the expense of 'where you are at'. But, what if one questions "Where am I at? Is it given by somebody else? Or, is it something that can be created by creative tension between where I am from and where I want to head for'?

Summary

Although it is not him but his parents whose homeland is Korea and who used to be - and still are - 'immigrants', Andrew's identity may not be read completely outside 'immigrant' identity : as he tries to and does understand his parents' hardships and values, and as he develops respect and appreciation for his parents, Andrew also shares part of their 'immigrant' identity. This is expressed through his identification with 'immigrant' parents as he speaks as a member of an immigrant family, on the one hand, and it seems to be particularly latent in, as well as manifested through, his peculiar 'class' identification as 'middle class but labor worker', on the other. For the formation of his 'ethnic' identity, the 'immigrant' status of his parents - thus, his own in a way - seems to be no less significant than any 'cultural' difference that he may find in his family tradition. For Andrew, the youngest with quite a wide age gap between himself and the next eldest sibling and the only 'Canadian-born' in his family, 'Koreanness', however it is defined, can be felt even more 'distant' than his other siblings may feel it. Yet, 'Koreanness' may be felt in various ways, particularly through his

---

discourses in which they are already represented as 'significant Others'. However, in many 'essentialist' discourses, the former question may signify "subjects without properties" (Lloyd) whereas the latter may connote 'originary', both of which surrender to a condition of marginalization. In Andrew's accounts, those questions of 'where...' appear to be present as a more 'essentialist' view from which they cannot be reconciled but only binarily opposed or treated in terms of mutually exclusive groups.

sense of self as being a member of an 'immigrant' family in which the tension between '(imagined/symbolic) homeland' and 'host (which is actual homeland for Andrew)' is nevertheless expressed.

This 'immigrant' identity may, however, be just a partial and overlapping expression of his 'ethnic minority' identity. As well, Andrew's affirmation of his parents and ethnic 'culture' represented by his parents can also be read as one of the ways in which he 'responds' to 'difference' in family features, which has always been one of the major sources that may have made him feel excluded from a 'white clique'. This 'different' family, along with the experience of racism, in turn provides some common grounds which he shares with his 'visible minority' friends but which, Andrew believes, "white friends don't understand".

His 'immigrant' family, as a source of 'difference', however, provides him not merely with 'common grounds' that he can share with his other 'visible minority' friends: when 'difference' as such is ignored, repressed or subordinated, it is also the genesis of his marginalization. Throughout his accounts, a 'white' family appears to operate as a reference point from which the 'difference' of his family is persistently and maybe often unconsciously measured. Although Andrew explicitly demonstrates his positive affirmation of the 'difference' of his family, it can be read otherwise when his assertion is paradoxically mingled by his ways of locating 'being ethnic' in the Canadian society. This may be related, though not coherently, to the ways in which he responds to, or presents his discourse on racism, although it should also be taken into consideration that the given narrative is not adequate to draw more confident interpretation on this matter. That is, his lived-experience of racism seems to be reproduced by and reproducing his discourse not only on racism itself but also on 'visible (ethnic) minority' as opposed to non-visible, non-ethnic, 'white'. Or, putting it differently, both as actual incidents and memories, racism seems to have constructed to a great extent his 'ethnic' self, that is his image of a 'visible minority' vis à vis an imagery of 'white' others, most of whom are explicitly described as racists, or, some of whom are, at best, 'less racist'.

Due to both the limited range of interview questions and the nature of the interview in which the narrator was relatively less actively articulating himself and his position, particularly in comparison with the other narrative (Narrative II), this aspect of his discourse on racism, for proper scrutiny and in-depth exploration, may have needed more extensive accounts by the narrator as well as a "fuller understanding of the context" in which relevant physical sites (e.g. youth sub-culture, patterns of formation of/interactions of members among 'cliques', etc.) are taken into account and the ways in which the construction and representation of ethnic/racial categories through everyday discourses are explored in a fuller fashion. Nevertheless, two aspects can be pointed out: In Andrew's accounts, particularly in relation to his discourse on racism, visible minority and white people, his ethnic identity seems to be to a great extent overlapped with his racial identity. In this respect, Andrew's bold association with 'visible minority' as well as his positive self-representation of being 'Korean' could be read as gestures of resistance to racism.

On the other hand, this 'positive' affirmation and gesture of resistance, seems to also be paradoxically distorted by his discourse on 'multi-cultural' Canada and 'diversity' upon which his social 'location' - or location of his 'ethnic' being is presented. This seems to be predicated upon ordinary discourses which are less critically reflexive but more mirroring of dominant ideology of subordinated/marginalized 'difference'. In this sense, Andrew's understanding, if not acceptance, of the marginalized status of 'ethnic Canadian' vis à vis 'non-ethnic Canadian' seems to tell us how disempowering rather than empowering the rhetoric of 'celebrating diversity' can be, unless an anti-racist and radically pluralistic as well as participatory citizenship education can provide him with other ways of understanding. After all, a mere 'positive' identification of one's 'ethnicity' does not necessarily guarantee the sense of being a fully participating 'citizen'/member of society.

Chapter Five

Narrative II: Stanley

Introduction

Stanley[27] is a high school student[28] who has been brought up for most of his life in a suburban area of Edmonton which he describes as "really White, really upper-middle class" (I shall name it Suburban A). His parents immigrated from South Korea to Canada in the mid-seventies and he was born a few years later. His family too might be described as suburban middle class; his parents, as he explains, have "worked at little jobs, put in hard hours, saved up money and bought a small business and then a bigger business". Thus, his family is now relatively "well-off". Although his school and family life have evolved around this suburban residence, his membership in one of the Korean churches in Edmonton has provided him with a sense of "support" in the search for his 'identity', which has recently become one of the central issues in his life. Stanley is the one interviewee who not only articulated his ethnic consciousness but also constantly placed this ethnic consciousness as *an* important dimension for constituting his selfhood. While most interviewees do not attempt to extend their accounts for their ethnic/racial identification beyond their peoplehood affiliation or adopting one of the 'available' alternative patterns of social gathering (e.g. "it just happened that way", "I can relate to them more because of the same experiences of parents and/or racism", etc.), Stanley attempts to account for his recent interest in his ethnicity and 'heritage' in terms of the issue of 'who he is'. That is, he actively searches for ways in which his selfhood can be found and/or created.

---

[27] Stanley was individually interviewed twice: Once during the initial data collection process and a second time at the stage of the initial writing-up. The second interview was conducted mainly in order to obtain more of his accounts on the issues that triggered my attention during the initial writing-up of Andrew's narrative. Thus, in the second interview, some interview questions, which turned out to have some significance in the interview of Andrew but had not been asked of Stanley in the first interview with him, were brought in and clarified. Stanley's participation in the group interview has also been included in this analysis.

[28] At the time when the first individual interview and group interview were conducted, he was in grade 12. The second interview was conducted about two month later, and by that time, Stanley had already graduated and begun to attend university.

From the interview with him, I had an impression that in this process of 'search', 'narration' or even narrating himself seems to be consciously taken by him as a way of learning about and renewing himself: As stated by Stanley: "I learn a lot from what I'm saying and what other people are saying [although] I usually contradict myself a lot. But, I'm working things out, so I'm gonna try to come over to good answer [UC + II: 6]". As his 'narration' is a more active and self-conscious act of articulation than that of Andrew, who rather 'responded' to my questions, Stanley's narrative may be seen as containing more of a self-explanatory quality than that of Andrew's. Combined with the fact that he is 'consciously' in search for his 'selfhood', this appears to create less 'margins' in his narrative than the interview data with Andrew does. In other words, his perception of 'ethnicity' in relation to himself and his life boundary and of its location in the Canadian society is more often 'articulated' than left 'unsaid' or 'hidden' in his representation of himself. This partly leads to the presentation of this section relying more on his explicitly expressed interpretation of the world.

Nevertheless, there are contradictions in his narrative from which we may read the ambiguity and confusion in his ideas and the tension between the space that he attempts to create and the boundary within which his attempts as such are confined. Or, putting it differently, there are the tensions between the kind of selfhood that Stanley wishes to 'ideally' construct and/or the potential that it holds and the discourses as well as conditions to which his experiences and perceptions are bound. Some of these confusions and contradictions in the narrator's accounts are highlighted in order to illuminate both the potential and limits of dislocation to marginality and resistance. At the immediately conceivable level, they are found in what are expressed as the narrator's 'preferences' by which certain issues and aspects in relation to ethnic identity or ethnicity are chosen to be explored and articulated, while the 'possible' others are left unsaid and unexplored. On the one hand, such contradictions may draw the attention of some educators to the issues of, as Frankenberg poses in her study of racism, "the languages available to us in 1990s, for talking about race, culture, selfhood, [and] otherness" (Frankenberg, 1993: 53). On the other hand, closely exploring the conditions from which those contradictions appear to emerge may also lead us to thinking about some 'limitations' which the subject seems to be confronted with and, to a great extend, bound within. And, it can be noted that the nature and boundary of such limitations seem to go beyond those created by the particular discourse of the narrator but rather to be related to the 'given' or 'available' physical space and sites. These seem to be often limited through and by that the actual cultural practice driven by the subject's particular needs, desires and 'preferences' or 'tastes' may sometimes be incompatible with his/her ideas which express what is deemed to be 'desirable' at the level of discourse.

Stanley narrates his present interest in, and pursuit of, his 'Korean side' in terms of his "life transition". His narrative traces this personal history. Certainly, this 'history' is not a mere collection of past events but a story mediated by his present perception and then re-told through my voice. In presenting his story, this section is written more chronologically than the presentation of Narrative I although only to a certain extent.

As in the analysis of Narrative I, the basic focus given to the reading of Narrative II was put on "how one (Stanley), both implicitly and explicitly, represents himself in relation to his 'ethnicity' and how he locates this 'ethnicity' in the larger societal contexts". This provides us with immediately conceivable terrain in which the deeper and less conceivable contexts and processes of one's identity construction may be captured. In this reading, the narrative of Stanley presents the tension between 'ethnicity' as "something reinvented and reinterpreted in each generation by each individual" (Fischer, 1986: 195) and his discourse as well as given materiality within which such a renewal is bound.

Being/Becoming 'Ethnic'

"I am Korean": A Source of Defensiveness in the Form of a Defense Strategy

The interviewees often demonstrate ambivalent feelings about 'Korean' or being Korean and Korean culture: it is expressed as a mixture of acceptance and rejection. While 'rejection' prevails in their description of their early childhood or early adolescent period, 'acceptance' tends to come later as they mature. In his description of his childhood, however, Stanley expresses how contradictory feelings of 'pride' and 'rejection' towards his 'ethnicity' both took over his childhood. In the particular context of community in which he spent his childhood, his 'ethnic identification' seems to have shown him its paradoxical functions: Stanley was proud of being Korean when he was able to use this ["I'm Korean"] to protect himself from negative generalization about Oriental people; yet, it appeared to be 'disturbing' when he wanted to be accepted by his [majority white] friends. In reflecting on his childhood in another small town where he had lived before he moved to Suburban A and in which "there were a majority of white residents plus Natives, but few Orientals", he explains how he had to protect himself from any disadvantages of being a visible minority.

> I was pretty defensive about it just because of the fact that I was different and I was a minority, I just had to defend myself, kids, you know, like, I don't think I ever got into a fight or anything but, yeah, there were some hurt feelings both ways [II:2]

Identifying himself as Korean was one of the strategies which made it temporarily possible for him to displace himself from a certain discriminatory category since, by clarifying that he was 'not Chinese nor Japanese', he was able to find a way to escape - or at least, he thought he could - from racist name calling against Oriental people, which was usually attached to those "well-known" Orientals such as 'Chinese' or 'Japanese'. So whenever he was asked 'where he was from' or 'what he was';

> I responded ... I was defensive, I was .... Korean. When people thought of Asians, the first they can come up with, I don't know why, but it's Chinese. They seem to generalize a lot of Asian and so, I just didn't like being called Chinese cause I'm not Chinese, and a lot of slang terms like racial comments are usually Chinese based, and (...) I can't think of too many Korean slang terms, like, what can you racially call Korean? I've never heard a swearword for Korean. (...) So I've never thought it [being called Korean] offensive. But, when they call me like a Chinese racial term, then I was still offended not because I'm not Chinese but it's just offensive, first because they mistook me as Chinese and they generalize it and because it's rude anyway just to call someone by a slang term. [II: 1] [So] I was proud when I was young where I came from because I knew I was different from everyone else [indicating 'other' Orientals who are subjected to 'racial slang terms'] [II: 2]

While Andrew (cf. Narrative I) perceives that self -identification, whatever it may be, did not and would not free him from 'racial' discrimination or the 'visible minority' status to which he has been constantly subjugated, his gesture of resistance can be read in his solemn identification of 'visible minority' in his self-representation to 'white' people, Stanley has chosen to use his specific ethnic identification as a defense strategy. While Stanley observes that he felt that such generalizations were unfair, what he wished to resist to was not so much the 'generalization' as such but the subordinate status that this generalization may have entailed: When he was called names, he was offended "not because [he was] not Chinese" [II: 1] but because "it's rude anyway just to call somebody by a slang term [II:1]." As long as "[he] was 'different' and [he] was a 'minority'" [II: 2], he could hardly be free from incidents of racial name calling and its offensiveness. Yet, as a little child, he could not stand it and had to find some way to deal with it. As well, what enabled him to use this strategy may not be merely individual choice but also his neighborhood environment which seems to have been different from Andrew's. Or, putting it differently, Stanley's perceptions of the social environment and racism as it is read in Stanley's description of racism directed either to himself or to other 'visible minority' people, appears to differ from that of Andrew.

> When I was growing up, it was just me against a lot of whites mainly, right? So, racism wasn't really there because eventually they understood what I was and accepted me as I was, not an outcast. I guess I was lucky that way, it could have been bad, but it turned out OK cuz, I don't know, sometimes I guess I was the first experience they had with Asians, so, maybe, they learned I guess, if, where they might not have and they got to know the different races, not just not everyone's Chinese, like, they might have thought ... yeah, I haven't seen it too much lately [...] I don't know, they might be there, but, it is pretty hidden, usually it's just people's thoughts, not like chasing after groups and trying to beat them up or anything. I haven't seen too much of that. [II: 2-3]

However, the seemingly different ways of putting the statement 'I'm Korean' in the childhood of both Andrew and Stanley ironically reflect the same phenomenon that each had to face: both were responses to racism (name calling) and expressions of their resistance to it. What Stanley's 'defensiveness' as such reflects, however, is the overwhelmingness of racism which goes beyond a young child's capacity to fight back. His idea that identifying himself as Korean would save him reflects his emotional defensiveness and a sort of gesture of resistance that he could come up with at best. In that sense, his picking up 'Korean' as a defense strategy, or the conditions which may - or may not - have enabled him to use it as such was rather arbitrary, and it may not have worked as he thought it would. Yet, still believing that his individual self-representation in itself could relieve him from disadvantage and subjugation, Stanley asserted that he was 'Korean'.

Peer, Family and 'Difference': Desire of Invisibility and Inescapable 'Visibility'.

In other cases, his 'visibility' - not only in terms of his 'color' but also in terms of his 'cultural' difference- is still salient and inescapable. Whereas Stanley chose to 'defend' himself in the case of racial name calling, which was rather clearly unfair and offensive in his view and to which he could find a way to resist, in the relationship with his peers Stanley rather surrendered himself to what Corrigan calls "the famous desire for invisibility"[29] (Corrigan, 1987: 21). In this relationship, Stanley had to deal with, or be subjugated to the 'mainstream' ideas on '(cultural) difference' in order to be 'accepted' as one of them. His compromise with the 'majority' was possible only by their 'acceptance', or so he perceived: In other words, he was still 'subjected to' not only how he himself was perceived but also how being 'different' was reflected by his peers.

> When you're a kid, I was trying to fit into a group that was there, which was only majority kids. [GR: 9] When I was a kid and you go through kindergarten and English and everything and you have, like English speaking friends and everything and then your parents impose Korean school and eating Korean food and all that stuff. Then, it's natural to reject what your parents want you to do and so that's Korean heritage so I rejected it. [GR: 4]

In his relationship with his peers, his family appeared to be not merely different from that of his peers' but in a sense 'lacking' or 'deficient' since he could "never [find] that structure [in his family] that a lot in popular culture [defined as] middle-class white suburban parents" [II: 4]. In spite of his acknowledgment that "there [was] nothing wrong with [his] parents", he also expresses the rebellious feelings he had against 'Korean' or 'Korean culture' which was represented by his parents. This entailed his 'rejection' of his parents and whatever they represented; not only anything that his parents practiced in upbringing of their children but also anything or anybody named as 'ethnic', 'culture', and so on since those names are attached only to the 'other than normal' families.

---

[29] Corrigan notes that "the famous desire for invisibility - praying that one's own group - which could be 'Oriental', 'Korean', 'immigrant', 'Asia', etc.- will not be mentioned [indicates that] already by then to be named as "one of them" is to be mentioned *and* marginalized simultaneously" (Corrigan, 1987: 21, the emphasis in original).

> Koreans, I don't know, I don't want to get all figurative but I saw it as Koreans kind of represent my parents and my family and I didn't want any part of my culture. Culture's a bad thing when you're a kid, right ? I think to everyone so I tended to hang around with white kids, which was in a way a rebellion. My parents were always like, 'why don't you hang out with Korean kids or cousins' and stuff, but I wanted to hang out with the white kid." [GR: 9]

On the other hand, in his relationship with his white friends the 'desire of invisibility' prevailed, which required him to 'act' like one of the rest of the kids.

> S(Stanley): I've always had to put on a little bit of acting in the Suburban A, like, sometimes I would act one way against the way normally I would act or the way I wanted to act, just because, you know the whole peer pressure, and then, the feeling of being left out and everything, so I would sort of act one way, not in a major drastic way, but it was just little thing to cover up, just make me seem like I was one of them.
>
> I(interviewer): Like what?
>
> S: Uhm, I'm trying to think ... I think the best example would be (...) even silly like, making up something my parents said (...) during some situations, just make it seem like they're like everyone else's parents, you know, whereas my parents normally would do one thing, I would say something else, just to make it seem like I was a normal kid. I knew that everything was OK and my parents had, there's nothing wrong with my parents, but, it's just this appearance I wanted to give off that, I had the same situation like everyone else, like, maybe I was getting an allowance, [in fact] I wasn't getting an allowance, right? (...) whereas if I needed it, my parents would have got it for me, whereas my friends, you got your allowance and you do this, so I was sort of saying, I got an allowance and just don't forget, just make it sound like I was one of them, had the same situation (...). [II: 4-5]

Obviously, getting along well with his peers could not solve the problem. In a way, he had to "always [feel] the odd man out because a lot of [his] friends had a lot in common" [II: 4] which he was not able to share. While he "did not feel so much left out" [II: 3] when hanging around with a "white oriented crowd", he still "did not feel [he] could share experiences that [he] has being Korean" with his white friends: one can still feel 'left out' not by overt exercise of exclusion but by tacit denial of inclusion, that is, a practice of 'absence'.

> A lot of my friends. I don't know, they had this system that you see on TV, the grounding, the chores, and all that, and I wasn't really accustomed to that so much, cuz my parents, it was like, you knew that they wanted you to do, like, they had this presence, but they never said 'well, you gotta do this now, you gotta do', well, they did, but it was just different, like, I've never found that structure that I see a lot in popular culture defining like middle-class white suburban parents where there, you know, they have this sort of thing about them, but I've never had that, so I couldn't really discuss that with my friends. [II: 4]

As well, Stanley's desire for 'inclusion in the white oriented peer group was negotiated at the expense of his rejection of his parents, that is, his perceiving them as 'Others'. Parts of his 'difference' (which constitutes the very parts of his activities in his family, activities which are indispensible for engaging in interactions with his parents) were already designated as 'Otherness' in this sense, yet, his 'difference' was also an inescapable reality to him: no matter how much he "wanted to give off that appearance" [II: 5]. Thus, no matter how much 'acting' he put on, Stanley himself knew that 'differences' as such already constituted a part of the world that he had to live through and in. By knowing this, yet also by perceiving his parents or his heritage in terms of 'Otherness', what he denied was not only his parents or 'heritage' but also his own presence. In other words, his constant 'acting' seems to have led him to nothing but self-alienation. In a way, this seems to unravel how ethnicity comes to matter to Stanley: ethnicity becomes "often something quite puzzling to the individual, something over which he or she lacks control" and something that is "often unsuccessfully repressed or avoided"[30] (Fischer, 1986: 195).

Dislocation and Marginality

As his attempts to 'fit in' entailed 'denying a part of him', Stanley started to think about the question of 'who he is' and wanted to dislocate himself from the place where he had to deny this 'part of him'; he felt he "was limited there" and needed some kind of shift in order to "find out more about [him]self" [I: 2]. Hence,

> as I grew older ... because I wanted to find out who I was myself and I can't deny that I'm Korean, right? So, I got to explore that, and when I was a kid, I never explored that cuz no kids explore, but now that I'm older, I'm trying to, like, backtrack a little and find out who I am and finding people who are like me [GR: 9] I thought maybe hanging out with these people [his Korean-Christian friends], I could learn a bit more and at the same time help them find out about themselves" [I: 2]

His exploration of these 'roots', as his narrative tells, took mainly two paths. One of them is dislocating himself from the 'mainstream' culture in Suburban A to this 'minority' culture, as he puts it, that is the 'culture' of his Korean Christian friends. In this Korean Christian youth clique, 'friendship' - more precisely 'the kind of friendship' he has sought - is deemed to be one of the most significant elements that makes him want to stay with this group. As well, it provides him with a sense of 'support' not only through activities of 'sharing experience and belief' that they have in common but also through his feeling of being 'secure '. Stanley names this 'belief' Christian values, although this could be seen as Stanley and his Korean-Christian friends interpretation of 'Christian' values.

On the one hand, 'ethnicity' for him seems to be no more important than his other 'backgrounds' that provide him a point of departure; that is, his 'ethnicity' is one of the multiple cultural elements of his selfhood by volitional recollection of which he can create the place in which he locates himself in order to 'depart'. For this matter, 'religion' (Christianity) is explained to be a more crucial element than 'ethnicity' in his emphasis on 'Christian ethics' in expressing who he is. On the other hand, his specific form of Christianity can be reflected as his way of making it meaningful for him to choose a particular marginality created by a particular [youth] culture, which is partly associated with his particular ethnicity. In this way, even 'ethnic (Korean) culture' is reinterpreted: and religion is seen as

---

[30] This issue of the 'emotional component' of ethnicity will be revisited with theoretical inquiries into identity construction in the concluding chapter.

> [p]retty big for Korean families, whether it be Buddhism or Christianity or whatever" [I: 8] Well.....I wasn't really getting that with the White crowd because they were pretty all ... all secular based and ... no real religion basis and ... and not too interested in anything about their cultures and so ... they were kind of limited in that way [I: 1]

To my comment that he could have still found a common ground with his white friends, if he had tried hard, he said:

> It is true, if you look for common ground, you can find it for sure and there was a common ground, but what I was looking for was not in that direction, really. I could have pursued that, but I didn't see ... I could have found a meaningful lasting friendship continuing with my Suburban A friends, but it wasn't the friendship I wanted, the kind I wanted, so it was just preference, I don't know, this is more who I am at this moment. [II: 4]

While Stanley constantly mentions 'religious' values as the basis of his choice, and although it must be true to some extent, this also can be understood in terms of certain 'youth cultures' that he rejects or affirms. That is in a way the two 'worlds', one of which Stanley displaces by the other, may be seen not so much as one of 'Christian' values vs. 'secular' based values; rather, it can be seen as a particular youth culture that Stanley and his Korean Christian friends constitute, which they believe to be based on what should be 'Christian', rather than the dominant, perhaps 'male', youth culture from which Stanley has chosen to dislocate himself. It is difficult within the limited scope of this study to identify the actual dynamics of the youth culture in Suburban A. - i.e. how (by what rules and values) it is organized, how it creates 'membership', thus, how it includes and/or excludes some kids, and how flexible or rigid it is in relation to change and challenge. But from his viewpoint Stanley broadly pictures some aspects of youth culture in Suburban A. which have some common and dominant features, whether 'mainstream' or not, features with which he could not relate.

> They [Stanley's friends in Suburban A.] were not mainstream as well, like, in my school, they weren't the popular kids, but they weren't the not popular kids. They were just middle kids and basically all middle class, usually White, not real trouble makers as well. But they, as high school went along, they started to get more into the drinking and sex and stuff, so that was then, but there were a few that, they didn't right, so me and a few other people, but still ... uhm, they were, I don't know, they had, I guess, they have their beliefs and the stuff, but they weren't too open about emotions and beliefs. They were always trying to, like, like me ... insecure, so they don't want to say anything that will, that someone can use against them, so they were playing it safe all the time, which was me, because I didn't want to do anything that would risk my, like, that was risky... [I: 2-3],

In contrast, the present clique (Korean and Asian Christian) which he hangs around with is described as

> ...diverse, but we all share in common, like, some of the basics, like, abstaining from drinking and partying and, I guess, premarital sex or whatever, all that stuff. We're kind of not part of that. [I: 2]...If I were to classify myself, I'm minority in society because I don't drink or, I don't, uhm... I'm not really part of the majority, I'm part of a smaller group of people, I think.

Learning and Practicing 'Culture'

The other path - or significant 'practice' - taken by Stanley in order for his search for 'roots' - hence for constituting his selfhood - is to learn and practice 'culture' - more precisely 'culture' of his particular ethnic which is 'Korean'. 'Korean culture', as Stanley understands it, is both latent and lacking in him. On the one hand, it may be embedded in him as he puts it:

> I guess I've been exposed to Korean all my life, but I've never practiced being Korean. I guess that's the way to put it because I've heard it, I've seen it and I've lived it all my life, but I've never actually spoken it too much, I've always known I've been Korean because I've been showered with Korean ideas and stuff, but I've never actually pursued to be Korean until that is, a little lately. [II: 5]

Yet, on the other, it can be by no means reified or essentialized in a monolithic form:

> I never really saw too much of the obedience, like movies portray Orientals, like, you know, and respect for elders. I grew up with very little respect for elders, I don't know why. I didn't really pick that up well, which I know, people picture that Orientals are having great respect to the elders and being really obedient and stuff. But, that part's been lacking cuz I'm fairly disobedient and not too respectful. So, that's what I picture Korean tradition is, but I can't see it in myself [I: 8]

'Culture', however, cannot be reduced merely to arbitrary individual choices or a structurally insignificant abstraction - thus, 'nothingness' - since it creates and binds the specific and substantive materiality of life particularly as forms of communication, structure of feeling and/or means for achieving them:

> When I was young [...] adults didn't really matter. But, now, the respect is kicking in, like, and I start to feel more respect for my elders and so I feel that it's only right that I should speak to them in Korean and, you know, *in-sa* (greeting) and everything. You have to show proper respect, so I feel that speaking English doesn't really cut it any more and I should speak to them in Korean and I feel more comfortable in that way too. [How did I start to be more respectful to the elders?] It just happened. As I started to visit more Korean homes, like, beside my own family, like, relatives and the stuff. Because with them, it was OK to speak in English, but as I started to visit more, like, my friends, Korean parents, it seems more necessary. It just did, right? It just seemed rude not to [...] I like to speak more comfortably with them. [I: 9]

This 'practice of culture' is demanded not only in terms of a rather abstract act of 'search for selfhood': in effect, it also seems to have a significance for his reconciliation with his parents to whose 'culture' Stanley, as a little child, denied belonging:

> I want to get along with my parents on a level that they always wanted me to. It seems that everything that they wanted me to do when I was younger I am doing cuz during my pre-adolescent years, I didn't want to do anything they wanted me to do. But, now, as I'm getting older, I guess I am doing everything, like, they

> think that I am doing everything that they wanted me to do, it's like, I just want to, I just want to change that much. [II: 5]

Once again, similar to Andrew's case, a partial aspect of this 'culture' of his Korean parents is represented through 'hard working' parents and the expectations placed on their children particularly with regard to their schooling and 'better' jobs. Yet, unlike in Andrew's accounts, this aspect is expressed by Stanley not in the sense of empathetic understanding and emotional sharing of hardship of 'immigrant' parents but rather in terms of a 'good work ethnic'. As well, in this way, Stanley expresses the ambivalence between the instillation or absorbability of structure of values and feelings, which he may have learned without consciously being aware of them, and the conscious desire to act in certain ways, to follow self-selected paths in life.

> They always wanted me to have like this, you know, how they work so hard, they don't want me to work hard, they want me to get to school and then get a job where I don't need to work too hard and I make OK money [...] Yeah, my parents want me to be safe and secure, but I want to explore that way [...] As of now, I still consider myself like one of their kids, so I should still give my parents, I don't know, the benefit of the doubt [...] but, now it's at a point where I have to start making my own decisions, so it stops where education and everything, yeah, it already stopped and now I'm picking it up as my own choice. They're not telling me to do it any more, but I'm doing it because I want to do it, and the things I want to do are a lot of things that my parents wanted me to do. So, that's kind of odd how that's working. I hope I don't do what they tell me to do about the future cuz I don't think I want to be safe and secure just for the sake of being safe and secure cuz that's not right. Just, like, go get a law degree, just become a lawyer just for sake ... and live OK. I don't think that's alright. I'd rather work hard like they did. You know, it's gratifying. I respect them for doing that because you know you're working with your hands and you know you're doing yourself and you're putting in hours of physical labor and, that's real work, right. [...] everything is there, so I respect them for that. Good work ethic. [II: 7]

Nevertheless, the very act of engaging in 'culture' needs agency, one who involves in re-creation of 'culture' through an act of interpretation.[31] Perhaps, Stanley's engagement in 'culture' needs more active and self-conscious (re-)interpretation due to the cultural ambivalence that his position as a 'second-generation Korean-Canadian' may entail: 'Koreanness' to this young second generation man does not have a necessary connection to 'homeland' Korea as a territorially bound, cultural and political entity, but seems to be recreated within the creative tension between 'where you come from' and 'where you are at'.[32] As well, this diasporic tension may lead him to an on-going renewal of self that may go beyond a fixed ethnic identification and stable association with a certain 'culture'. Stanley partially narrates such aspects in his explanation of his recent engagement in learning 'Korean culture' by clarifying that 'Korean' as the roots he is searching for does not refer to some specific and historic pattern of behavior which he must incorporate:

> Middle during high school, you know, when I thought of hard-core Korean, you know, they listen to the Korean music, they speak Korean, they eat everything, there were hard-core Korean, you know, Fresh-off-the-boat. That always kind of turned me off, I was like, uh, I don't know if I want to do that. That's like being your parents only younger, right? But, now that I think about it. Yeah, that aspect still ... I don't want people to look and think I'm a FOB. I'm not denying my existence as a person in Canada cuz I am a Canadian citizen. I have to accept that I have a lot of Western ideas and influence, but I've also got to incorporate my Korean into that, so, right now it's just like a big rush of , it hasn't been really gradual. It's like all of sudden, 'yeah, I can start learning language', well, I don't know about the food, I've heard some music and I've seen some shows, and it's just, getting into the whole thing, just incorporating it into my life, not transforming into hard-core Korean, but just bringing the good stuff into me, just making me more of a whole, cuz I'm not one hundred percent Korean, I'm not one hundred percent Canadian, but I'm a bit of both, so, that's why. I gotta bring up the Korean half of that cuz I've been denying it for too

---

[31] In using the example of his British born Jamaican Black son, Stuart Hall maintains: "[One] has to learn to tell himself the story of his past. He has to interrogate his own history, he has to relearn that part of him that has an investment in that culture" (Hall, 1991: 19)

[32] An autobiographical narrative with critical insights on this issue of the tension stemming from disaporic identity is that of Ien Ang, 1993.

> long. So, it's not becoming Korean. It's just opening up what was inside of me, and just, you know, yeah, getting more out of life because I've only seen half the picture whereas I can see a lot more. And that doesn't stop with Korean. It could go anywhere from that, but I guess a good place to start is with your ethnic roots. So, right now I don't know how long it will last, but I hope it lasts for a while. And it's always been there. I'm just letting it come out now. I'm seeing it for the first time. And I like it. It's a good thing. It's new. First change in a while [II: 7]

Although Stanley expresses such diasporic tensions of 'culture(s)' in his narrative, a glimpse of his ideas about 'Korea as contemporary native Korea' can also be noticed in his reference to current popular culture in South Korea as a part of cultural practice. But, in the group discussion, Stanley implicitly and explicitly expresses the position that he does not try to seek the 'Korean side' of his 'roots' in this contemporary [popular/youth] culture of native Korea. As well, whereas 'Korean culture' in Andrew's accounts is explained to be represented solely by his parents, for Stanley the 'Korean culture' that he understands and pursues is to a great degree represented by his Korean (Christian) friends [II: 3].

Future-Making and Tracing-Back: 'Roots' As a Departure

As pointed out earlier, Stanley articulates that his recent interest in his heritage reflects his self-conscious search for a - perhaps more authentic - selfhood. In this intentional journey, his 'roots' provides him with a point of departure: "[now] I know what my roots are, which is a start. I don't know who I'm gonna be, but I know what I started with."[I: 1]

In this sense, his shift from one to another 'culture' is - and is seen by himself as - a 'transitional' phase, not a 'complete' destiny; and the emphasis can be put rather on the act of 'dislocation' itself than on 'ethnic identity' as such. Such transition may not be 'ethnic' *per se* but if people are locked into either limited identities or particular discourses, the consequences would seem to be the same.

Stuart Hall argues that we need to conceptualize ethnicity in terms of the dialectics of a search for one's 'roots' and the process of such discovery through which (s)he has actually come to create her/his 'ethnicity'. Thus he says:

> They need to understand and revalue the traditions and inheritances of cultural expression and creativity. And in that sense, the past is not only a position from which to speak, but it is also an absolutely necessary resource in what one has to say. There is no way, in my view, in which those elements of ethnicity that depend on understanding the past, understanding one's roots, can be done without. But, on the other hand, ... our relationship to that past is quite a complex one, we can't pluck it up out of where it was and simply restore it to ourselves.... [One] has to learn to tell [him/her]self the story of [his/her] past. [(S)he] has to interrogate [her/his] own history [and] *relearn* that part of [her/him] that has an investment in that culture... So the relationship of the kind of ethnicity I'm talking about to the past is not a simple, essential one - it is a constructed one. It is constructed in history, it is constructed politically in part. It is part of narrative. We tell ourselves the stories of the parts of out roots in order to come into contact, creatively, with it. So this new kind of ethnicity - the emergent ethnicities - has a relationship to the past, but it is a relationship that is partly through memory, partly through narrative, one that has to be recovered. It is an act of cultural recovery. (Hall, 1991: 18-9)

Perhaps this is the way to understand Stanley and his search, and to recognize it as, at the present stage of each of their lives, a much different process than Andrew's, which may be said to be still experiential and relatively less conscious and less reflective. As well, the way in which Stanley approaches his 'culture(s)' as well as ethnicity can be seen as similar to the notions conceptualized by some authors through the metaphor of 'hybridity' as mentioned in the conceptual framework.

A place for 'ethnicity' in multi-cultural Canada

In a broader picture of Canadian society, Stanley's understanding of 'ethnicity', as he explicates, resembles an 'ideal' blueprint of Canadian multiculturalism. To my question of how he understands 'multiculturalism', Stanley responded in length:

> [...] The Native Indians are our native inhabitants, but, and a lot of the Western like white people from England and everything, but, when you think of Canada, you are supposed to think of a lot of

> races as one race called Canadian and you have all these ethnic minorities making up one big majority. [...] [I]n Canada, [...] you're gonna see lots of different races, which I do. And, that's the population aspect of it, but, I guess as far as the 'culture' in multiculturalism ... my main exposure to it has been stuff like, it's a kind of minor, but, like Heritage Days in Edmonton where you see all the different things. It's kind of supposed to be a celebration, it's not really picking up or anything. Canadians don't really go 'yeah! we're multicultural' or anything, but, I think it's pretty cool where you can't really define Canadian to like just there's a white group or anything, you see a lot of different faces, at least I do, right? When I think of Canadian, I see Native Indians, and Asians, and African-Canadians, I guess, you just see a lot of races. Yeah, I've been exposed to a lot of races, and so I would have to say Canada is multicultural, that's what it means to me having them all in the same group and not being labeled as Japanese Canadian but just Canadian, you know. It's not like they get incorporated in and then they lose their identity, but their identity makes up our big identity, that's multiculturalism where they add to the big melting pot. [II: 9]

It seems to some degree that, in Stanley's narrative, 'white' as a category of domination is not present as in Andrew's narrative. In a way, Stanley is refusing any 'normative core' for citizenship, which is often represented as 'white' Canadian. Or, putting it differently, it may be said that in his map of society, 'Korean/ethnic minority' and 'Canadian' does not constitute a binary opposition. While Andrew might, perhaps, also acknowledge that 'Canada' as a 'nation' is not equivalent to White as a dominant race, the binary distinction between domination of White and marginalization of 'ethnic (visible) minority' in his 'memories' and discourse makes his map of society ambivalent on this issue, Stanley's idea seems to be relatively clear on this matter. For instance, Stanley expresses elsewhere in his talk about his 'Korean side' and 'Canadian side' that whatever 'majority' or 'mainstream' culture represents does not necessarily need to be defined as 'Canadian' but, in his experience, "it just happens to be a lot of [his] white Canadian friends represent "a lot of ... it's not the Canadian side, but, it just happens to be a lot of my white Canadian friends represent a lot things......" [II]), 'Korean/ethnic minority' and 'Canadian' in his mind does not constitute a binary opposition. Instead, as he puts it, "one big minority (Canada)" is - supposed to be - made up of "all these ethnic minorities" without one losing its 'identity'.

Community of Inclusion and Confined Marginality

Stanley, who challenges one of his Korean Christian friends, perceiving this friend's association with Korean or Asian youth as a very (self) limited cultural practice or even a racist idea[33], cannot find an unambiguous explanation to justify his own association with Korean or Asian Christian youth. The only explanation that he can give is that 'choices' available to him are not of so much variety, while he believes that some youth groups provide him with things that he wishes to pursue, which other groups do not (e.g. some kinds of values, some kinds of pleasure or 'fun', some kinds of personal relationships, particularly friendship, some kinds of overall atmosphere - or perhaps, the structure of organization/unspoken regulations of the 'clique', etc.). Obviously, even within the clique with which Stanley now associates, tastes, ideas and preferences on certain domains or issues are diverse. Yet, Stanley says that, it is not only the common grounds shared by this Korean Christian youth group (i.e. religious belief, experience of 'immigrant/Korean' parents, experiences of feeling 'left out' in White oriented cligues, etc.), which ensures his active participation, but that he can at least "feel secure" in terms of being able to try whatever he wants to do without feeling excluded or condemned. In a way, Stanley feels that, in this group, he is not forced to be silent or to 'make up some acts' in order not to jeopardize his membership and inclusive participation. As well, as he explains, Stanley is clear that his (ethnic) association is far from meaning that he uncritically conforms to 'Korean culture' or 'his parents' will': He emphasizes the significance of acknowledging his presence in Canada as a member of the society and of seeking an alternative way not to violate his presence in these multiple communities.

On the other hand, Stanley's 'ideal' picture of creating 'new' space is nonetheless confronted not only by his own confined discourse but also by limited physical sites and materialities which his life boundary and his activities rely upon. As in any discourse, his discourse, to a greater or lesser degree, contains self-contradictory rhetoric and demonstrates some ambivalence in his accounts of his experience and belief. At the same time, it is not only his discourse but also physical sites of his life boundary that presents some duality or ambivalence. In contrast with his own accounts which picture his ideal of creating 'the third' out of 'two cultures', Stanley also repeats that he has to make either-or decisions most of the time as he has his 'personal preferences' and limitations in time and energy and finds that the 'choices' or 'worlds' offered to him are often binarily divided.

---

[33] See, Appendix A (Group interview) for some points on this matter. b

> You have a bowl of water and take two cups, right? You can't all of a sudden add more water to make up for what you lose in one cup. [I mean] you only have so much to work with. You only have so much time and energy and what not. You can spend with one thing or other. One culture or the other, right? And if you spend a lot of time and energy in one culture (...) Then, you start to deviate to Korean things, you have to take away from one in order to have more time for the other. You have to. You can't just make new time and new interest to all of a sudden get into this Korean stuff. [GR: 13]

This virtual reality that his everyday life is evolved around may lack physical sites in which he feels that he can 'incorporate' both cultures in a true sense, or he can actually exercise such an incorporation. This can be one of the limits and confinements within which he may feel caught up. That is, while, on the one hand, Stanley criticizes Eric's association with Korean or Asian to be self limited, he also finds, on the other hand, that his life evolves around in a rather limited physical boundary. As a result of his recent association with Korean friends, he not only tends to be "cut off" from his other possible relationship but also receives some "heat" from his White friends.

> Stanley: (...) in a way I think it [his attempt to find his self through contacts with and learning from his Korean Christian friends] has brought me closer to my parents - just because you hang out with Koreans. But on the other hand, I'm getting away from my white friends which might be a bad thing because I went from there and almost made a complete transition to Koreans. Like almost in one year, I went from one to the other. Now I'm getting some strange talk...
>
> Ralph: Some heat...
>
> Stanley: Some heat from my White friends.

> Interviewer: Like what?
>
> Stanley: Life stuff like, "you like your other friends better!"
>
> Ralph: Yeah, "you never hang out with us any more".
>
> Stanley: Cause we're in a situation where we're in our little Northern Pole, right? And we have our white friends here and we worked on this basis, we worked with our white friends for so many years, we worked hard at it, right? And then all of a sudden, we start to find this other thing, we're like "Wow" and then we spend more time over here. And then just through technicalities, like, we came here, we don't want to go back and forth, we stay here, right? And then we're like, "this is great! We'll spend more time here" and then these white friends are like "you're dissing us", as Ralph would put it, and "you're not hanging out with us anymore". My friends see it as you like them better. You have more fun with them, these guys here. But, that's not true. In a way, it's true, but I also identify with them better, right?
>
> Eric: Yeah, but you do have more fun, don't you?
>
> Stanley: Well, I do. Yeah. But, I can't deny that I had some with them too. But, also there's a third side of this coin, I don't know how a coin can have its third side, but my friends back home they all do some of the things that I do, but the majority of the time, it's a lot of just partying, drinking, and club hopping and that's not really my thing.

Stanley may have little opportunity to let his white friends understand what he has gone through and what all these recent changes mean to him. It could be possible that his white friends may interpret all these simply in terms of his "ethnic affiliation" while the internal dynamics of each group is left not understood, considered or reflected upon. It can also be true that while, within a particular 'clique', Stanley is encouraged or allowed to speak up and challenge not only other's but also his own ideas, his critical challenge seems to often cease to be exercised beyond the boundary in which he feels 'secure'. For instance, while in the group interview, Stanley was able to 'confront' Eric's idea which he perceives as a "deeply rooted" - although subtle - "racist idea"[34] , the individual interviews with him show that he never raised the issue of possibly existing 'subtle' racism against himself or other 'people of color' with the same or similar degree of opposition or resistance to it as he did with Eric, even when the issue of racism was the focus of our conversations.[35].

I think that one way to reflect on/interpret this can be that although Stanley chose not to be subjugated to any force of assimilation to the mainstream norm, and to stay in a position of marginality ('minority' culture(s) in multiple senses including 'ethnic') and learned to feel empowered and able to challenge within the group, this 'marginality' may no longer hold its 'challenging' power 'in relation to' mainstream/ dominant culture(s) or group(s). In a sense it ceases to be a 'marginality' for him, in the sense that this space or community, once having been 'margin' in relation to the 'mainstream' social world, does not exist as a 'margin' in Stanley's map of the social world as he comfortably inhabits within its internal dynamics, where he is 'safe and content'. Thus, his 'power' and ability to 'challenge' in one particular setting or community may not be extended to another setting or community unless he is provided with some physical sites and space (and some interruptions) in which both his life activities can engage in significant ways in the 'other' community, and issues of importance to him sustain their significance in such settings.

Summary

Stanley's story is an articulated narration of his 'self-conscious' search for his selfhood. 'Ethnic identity', as he puts it, is certainly significant in this intentional journey in terms of better understanding of his 'roots' as a point of departure. The aspect of ethnicity as a "deeply rooted emotional component" (Fischer: 195) in Stanley's narrative may be read in his account as what made him feel "more me" in an environment which had forced him into self-alienation and self-denial. On the one hand, this 'emotional' component of ethnicity can be partially demystified by bringing into examination the ways of how his life engages in significant ways in multiple communities, particularly in terms of the inclusive/exclusive practice of participation in those communities and his desires or needs for 'sharing', 'openness' and 'support' in this process of participation and learning. Putting it more concretely in the case of Stanley, we may find in his narrative of lived-experience, particularly that of his early childhood, that he has struggled with some pressures which allowed little space in which his multiple participations and memberships can co-exist in a harmonious way: each of the two major sites (family and peers) has constantly denied or limited his participation in the other community and more or less forced him to choose one against another.

---

[35] Stanley once briefly mentioned: "... I haven't seen it [racism] too much [...] they might be there, but, it is pretty hidden usually it's just people's thoughts, not like chasing after groups and trying to beat them up or anything. I haven't seen too much of that" (II: 3). While Stanley insists on a danger of 'subtle' racism in Eric's 'thought' and urges a critical challenge and deconstruction of it, he takes this racism in other people's thought as more permissable and tolerable even by being hesitant to call it racism.

The 'culture' of his ethnicity to Stanley is ambivalent in that, on the one hand, its content is hard to articulate in a stable, distinctive way, while, on the other, its existence/presence, as well as some necessity to learn and practice it, is hard to deny. As Stanley constantly expresses his attempt to create a 'new' space out of the tension between 'where he comes from' and 'where he is at', his current engagement and eagerness to 'practice' his heritage inevitably involves his reinterpretation of his (ethnic) 'culture' based on his presence in Canada. Yet, there are also a certain degree of the 'given' to him as he actively engages in the communities of not only his family or of the first generation Korean-Canadians, with which he has recently come to have increasing contact, but also of this second generation youth community[36].

As developed in the previous section, there is an aspect of the limits in his discourse on race, ethnicity, experience and society that may be found in the contradictions of his accounts. While the confinement of discourse in Andrew's narrative may illuminate how identity can become "'locked' into certain behaviors, desires, and visions of the past, present, and future (i.e. how they both adapt to and resist Western hegemonic arrangements of knowledge and power [and 'difference'])" (McLaren, 1992: 131), that of Stanley's can be interpreted as lack of critical examination on the contexts, in which his 'experiences' have evolved and his identity has been constructed, as well as lack of empathic understanding of 'collective' experiences and memories.

---

[36] Although Stanley is one of the relatively older members of this second generation youth community.

Furthermore, although Stanley has chosen to stay in the margin, that is, to be 'ethnic' and to be 'minority', for and by which some radical educators attempt to create the language for sites of contestation and radical possibility through the term 'marginality'[37], it can be noted that the present 'margin' chosen by Stanley may lose its quality of 'marginality' as the relationship, which created its margins or forced Stanley to choose the margin, diminishes or disappears from the significant sites of his experience [38]. With the example of Stanley's discourse, I seek to display 'ethnic identity' as a contestation and resistance, yet, I also try to indicate that radical potential is not necessarily 'inherent' in it as we may sometimes wish to romanticize. Self-conscious critical reflection on one's own discourse as well as the intentional act of mapping one's own lived-experience within the broader social context are critical for transformative thoughts and practices.

It can be noted as well that, without conscious interventions and actions to create 'physical' space where people with diverse backgrounds, experiences and even 'preferences' can communicate and dialogue with each other and seek and share some common grounds, Stanley's 'ideal' picture of cultural 'incorporation' without negation or violation of his self-representation may be found less feasible to actualize. In this sense, the issue of 'limitations' is not merely the matter of confinement in discourse and/or ideology. The 'limitations' can also stem from limitations of 'physical space' offered and available to those youth in which they can expand their scope, dialogue and understand each other (as well as taking opportunities to let (the significant) others understand themselves) and find out some commonalities to 'share', in spite of 'diversity'. Particularly educators, who may seek practical implications of 'discourse analysis' such as this, may concern the lack of physical space, which seems to deepen as students enter higher grades and may create serious problems. Without conscious interventions, it may sustain youth groups' indifference or ignorance about each other, or viciously reproduce antagonistic ideological constructions of '(the) others'. In this respect, educators committed to encourage learners to develop critical thoughts and transformative practices may need to pay more attention to the significance of creating actual sites of cultural practice. For, as Foucault observed, "practices [which the subject exercises in constituting himself (sic)] are ... not something that the individual invents by himself [but] patterns that he finds in his culture and which are proposed, suggested and imposed on him by his culture, his society and his social group" (Foucault, 1988: 11).

---

[37] In her political and pedagogical discourse, bell hooks (1990) conceptualizes self-consciously chosen 'marginality' as a space for radical self-renewal:

> I am located in the margins. I make the distinction between that marginality which is imposed by the oppressive structures and that marginality one chooses as a site of resistance - as occasion of radical openness and possibility (hooks, 1990: 153)

---

[38] In this sense, the notion of 'marginality' or 'resistance' - and any other pedagogically illuminating notions - should always be read in a particular context of the empirical world and not mistaken as having an ontological (and radical) status inherent in its manifestation.

Chapter Six

Conclusions/Reflexion

This study may lack a sense of closure since it is an exploratory study and the reflections in this chapter will inevitably generate more questions than 'conclusions'. The task set for this chapter is twofold, although the two elements are intertwined. First, I will synthesize the previously presented two narratives in such a way as to respond to the research questions, both the major one asking "how is ethnic identity constructed?" and the questions that I posed in the introductory chapter - that being issues of struggles, limits and possibilities with which the narrators may have been confronted in the course of their ethnic/racial identity construction. Secondly, the conceptualization of (ethnic) identity construction will be revisited in such a fashion that some of my theoretical reflexions on the empirical world and my empirical inquiries on theories can dialogue one with the other.

This dialogical reflection between theory and field addresses issues in two major domains. On the one hand, drawn from the reflections on my own analysis of/approach to the narratives, I will address some methodological and conceptual concerns on existing studies of (ethnic) identity construction. On the other hand I wish to exploit what I have learned from a closer observation of the ordinary discourses and everyday life of the narrators in order to draw out some educational/pedagogical implications on anti-racist, multicultural and citizenship education and to address the issues of identity, culture, desire, visions, participation and empowerment in respect to some educational discourses on identity. While all those reflections may have implications for further research, some suggestions for specific research sites and themes will be briefly discussed at the end of this chapter.

Difference, 'Minority', Culture and Sense of Ethnic/Racial Self

It is clear from the narratives that 'ethnicity' as a contested category may become - particularly to 'ethnic (visible) minority' youth in Canada - a significant reference point for constituting selfhood when the salience of their 'differences' is represented to them in terms of 'ethnicity' and compels them to respond in one way or another to that representation. To Andrew and Stanley, who are not only 'members' of an ethnic minority but also 'members' of a 'visible' minority *and* the children of Korean parents who immigrated to Canada in the 1970's, they can hardly escape learning a sense of 'ethnic' self in the landscape of their childhood in which racism (in rather visible forms) and the norms of 'middle class white family structure' (in rather invisible forms) seem to have constantly confronted them with 'Otherness'. In this way of understanding, it can be said that their sense of ethnic self is constructed not at all independently from their sense of racial (visible minority) self as well as the sense of being a 'cultural minority' although one aspect at times becomes more predominant than the other.

Andrew's narrative seems to invite us to the site of a lived-experience of racism both in the form of recurring incidents and as a prevailing discourse: it partially unravels how the subject, or perhaps more accurately the narrator's subjectivity, is constructed in this course of lived-experience which is intermingled with 'encounters of actual incidents' of racism and a 'discourse of experience'. In Andrew's narrative, his childhood experience of racism seems to be deeply inscribed in his memories not merely as unpleasant incidents of discrimination but also repressive experiences of subjugation. On the one hand to children, who cannot define but only respond-either by accepting or resisting- the terms by which they are designated, experiences of racism can also be moments of learning both the categorical boundary between them and the (racial) Other and the power relationship residing in it. Andrew recalls how he used to deal with those incidents, which can be seen as a result of his 'child's incapacity to define the terms in his own way' (Frankenberg, 1993). In his narrative, on the other hand, the way in which Andrew recalls his own responses[39] to those incidents seems to, in a way, mimic his present responses to the ethnic/racial categories used to designate him. That is, it can be said that his lived-experience of racism, either as incidents or as memories of them, reflects, to some degree, his present understanding of the world in which the boundary of 'minority' vis à vis 'majority' is seen to be predominantly racially (white vs. non-white) determined.

---

[39] For example, see his earlier quoted statements "Well, (I've done) nothing (about it). What am I supposed to do? Usually they're with their friends but I'm alone or something. There's nothing you can really do in a situation like that" (I: 2)

Furthermore, the asymmetrical power relationship between (visible) minority and (white) majority is perceived by him to be manifested in daily life. That is in Andrew's narrative, the boundary between 'us as minority' and 'them as majority' appears to be predicated, to a great extent, upon his conceptual mapping of the world in which the racial demarcation, between 'white' and 'non-white', is perceived to rather unambiguously and predominantly function in the various domains of everyday encounters and cultural activities. For him the category of 'us as minority' is somehow bounded to some multidimensionality and fluidity in its boundary construction; its boundary is sometimes ambiguous and overlapping among for example, visible minority, Korean, and immigrant family. But 'them as majority' appears to be unambiguous and more strictly refers to 'white' regardless of ethnicity, generations of immigration, etc. Racism is a, perhaps the, most significant element that constructs Andrew's white imagery: it provides the logic of his discourse on 'white'.[40] In this respect, his conceptual mapping of self, others, and ethnicity/race seems to take shape and be fed by 'racism', both as recurring incidents and recurring memories, whereas his discourse on racism seems to feed in turn the former.

Similar to Andrew's narrative, Stanley's narrative reveals to us that ethnic/racial difference and the sense of being 'minority' was in the forefront of his childhood consciousness and struggle. However, not only the physical sites of his lived-experience in relation to ethnicity/race and racism but also his conceptual mapping of self, others and race/ethnicity with regards to notions of 'minority' and 'difference' differ from those of Andrew. It seems that in the physical and social environments which Stanley was subjected to, racism was not an obvious source of ongoing conflict. As well, aside from the similarities in experience (that is the racial name calling by other children, having 'immigrant' parents which entailed feelings of exclusion from their white oriented cliques, and the presence of a sense of 'being minority' in the stories of both Andrew and Stanley), the boundary of 'minority' in Stanley's discourse seems not to be predominantly determined by race and ethnicity: rather it is highly influenced by the addition of being an active member of the Korean Christian youth community. Although he acknowledges that he perceives the mainstream majority culture of youth and of Canada to be that which is represented by most of his White friends, Stanley's notions of 'mainstream', 'majority' and 'minority' are not predicated upon a binary racial demarcation of people or the culture(s) pertinent to each term.[41]

---

[40] See Chapter Four for the details, particularly my interpretations on what the contradictions in Andrew's own remarks on racism (e.g. 'little or no racism in my school'/'white people in my school are really racist') could possibly reveal to us.

To Andrew and Stanley, 'culture(s)', whether that of their family's or of their peers, appear to be a necessary media to be engaged in and mastered in order to obtain more satisfactory 'relationships'. Their peers (and different 'cliques' of those peers that are available to them) as well as their family are already given to them as communities in which they carry on their lives. These 'communities', in most cases and to a great extent, have already been established based upon certain ways of doing things or ways of being (often without explicit rules) and internal dynamics that those narrators need to learn in order to participate in interactions and to fulfill their needs, whatever they may be.[42] At the same time, to both Andrew and Stanley, 'culture(s)' practiced in their family is substantially different from those of the families of most of their white peers. Cultures of family and (white) peers are not merely different from each other: there seems to have been little space in either the culture of the family or the white peers in which the difference(s) of each can be admitted and positively nurtured without rejecting the very existence/presence of the other.

In Andrew's narrative, a search for cultural heritage or the practice of culture (or what it means to be Korean) does not seem to be at the forefront of his consciousness. This means neither that it is insignificant to him nor that he understands little about it. Rather, it means that Andrew deals with it as a natural part of him which does not need to be re-defined with conscious articulation. This should not be (mis)interpreted to imply that he does not have on-going conflicts in relation to what is given to him as 'Korean culture' as he understands it, but is intended only to point out a certain 'taken-for-grantedness' of himself in relation to Korean culture.

---

[41] It seems to be clear that these narrators including the interviewees other than Andrew and Stanley have some sense of 'being minority' in one way or another, even if given multiple meanings. However, there is variation in what it means to be a 'minority' to the narrators and the ways, forms, degrees, and natures in, to and by which this sense of 'being minority' is embodied in lived-experience of everyday encounters and their discourses. It is also interesting to note that the two female narrators (Samantha and Sally) differ from Andrew and Stanley in regards to the presence or absence of a sense of being 'minority' (See Appendix).

[42] While 'family' is given in a rather stable form, especially when individuals are not yet adult members, 'cliques' of peers can be relatively more easily changed in their shape, members, boundary and internal dynamics over different times and territorial boundaries.

'Culture' implicitly and explicitly expressed in Stanley's narrative is both stable and dynamic. On the one hand, Stanley rejects the idea of one-to-one correspondence between a person and his ethnicity expressly through his active engagement in (re)interpretation and (re)creation of Korean (and Canadian) culture. On the other hand, however, Stanley's narrative also unveils to us the none-the-less significant play of 'culture(s)' in learning/unlearning, (re)routing, and/or fulfilling his activities, behaviors, desires and visions in relation to other members in each community and in interrelations among a number of significant communities in his life boundary. 'Korean culture', as one of the major 'culture(s)' in which he has been and/or is inhabiting, has come into play in constructing his (ethnic) identity in itself and/or[43] in interaction/collision with the 'mainstream' culture, which may manifest itself in multiple ways[44] yet which, in his narrative and at the most immediate level, is most present in the form of (and represented by) the culture of his white peers.

Some methodological concerns

By 'methodological' here, I refer not only to methods of analysis in a narrow sense but also to the dimension in which the researcher's conceptual frame for approach to the phenomenon intersects with the focus of her interest as well as her research rationale.[45] Reflecting on how I have initially approached the phenomenon under study and how it could have been otherwise, I wish to focus particularly on two aspects, one related more to theoretical perspectives, the other related more to the ethics of reading ethnographic narratives.

---

[43] By using the phrasing 'in itself and/or in interaction with' I am trying, on the one hand, to affirm that '(Korean) culture' is present, and its internal logic (although hard to pin down while avoiding a creation of a typology of a set of ascriptive characteristics that I cannot do in this study) comes into play in a significant way in their (not necessarily need to be named as 'ethnic' identity) identity (one's position in social space) construction. On the other hand, however, I also wish to emphasize that 'Korean culture' becomes significant in constructing one's sense of *ethnic/racial* self only through the interaction/collision with culture(s) other than 'Korean' (which is the "White middle class cultural norm" in a most salient/dominant form and in a most troubling way) and some 'play of difference' which is situated within the larger societal map of asymmetrical power relationship between (majority/minority) races.

[44] For example, multiple ways such as mass media/mass culture, curriculum, mainstream youth culture, etc., all of which must be diverse in their forms/internal dynamics and in the specificity of their regulations or ways of doing things, yet all of which share in common a 'white (Anglo-Saxon?) middle class' norm to a certain degree.

Amongst some tacit perspectives that I brought into the field in approaching the issue of ethnic identity construction were my understanding that ethnicity is not a matter of 'culture' as implied by popular common-sense concepts of Canadian 'multi-culturalism' (which I perceived to be predicated upon the presumption of a correspondence between a particular ethnicity and a particular culture) as well as my desire, based on a specific rationale, to explore the issue of ethnic identity construction outside of this 'cultural' frame: the notion of 'culture' within any project that deals with the issue of 'ethnicity' seems to me to already be a too contaminated term which can hardly avoid a (mis)use which confirms 'essentialism'[46] and thus may naturalize social categories and dismiss certain social forces or power relations in constructing boundaries, particularly in the historical/political context[47] behind Canadian multi-culturalism and ethnic/racial relationships. Thus, refusing to perceive 'ethnicity' as a stable and naturalized differentiation of people, I approached the phenomenon by focusing on how and when 'ethnicity', primarily by the play of (politics of) difference, becomes a troubling, somehow forced social category to the narrators.

---

[45] See my quote in chapter two from Rosenau (1990) on her definition of methodology.

[46] McCarthy and Crichlow (1993) define essentialism as "the tendency in current mainstream and radical writing on race [ethnicity] to treat social groups as stable or homogeneous entities. [From this perspective] differences [are defined] in terms of transcendental essences" (McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993: xviii). As I reflect on myself, this fear of being essentialist seems to have resulted partly from the (unaware) influence of postmodern discourse on my self-representation. That is, it not only resulted from my own experience of finding myself becoming less and less capable and confident of identifying or articulating the nature of "(authentic) Korean culture" (from which I came), but also prevailing within myself a text so that I no longer feel 'right' to speak about myself/or my 'culture'.

[47] I decided not to bring in any detailed discussions on the political/historical context, apart from some theoretical perspective which places ethnic identity construction as a competitively labeled different aspect in the same line as racial and national (citizenship/its socio-cultural and political subject) identity construction. For the historical and political context of Canadian ethnic relationship and nation building, see, Roxana Ng (1993): with the conceptual framework of Gramsciam notions of common sense, ideology and hegemony, her study deals with the ideological construction of ethnicity and race in Canada.

Having found in the narratives of the participants some specific and concrete forms of lived-experience and the construction of one's sense of ethnic self or being, not merely 'Korean' in itself but 'Korean in Canada', certainly involves among the narrators, the process of learning to be/become an ethnic and racial Other vis à vis non-ethnic (sic) citizens in the still racially/ethnically unequal and unjust society. However, there seems also to have emerged some aspects in the narratives which appeared to be significant in talking about how one's sense of ethnic self may be constituted but the details of which my initial conceptual framework tends to ignore or be unable to highlight. It was this dimension for which I was not able to fully and analytically account in my interpretations except for a partial incorporation through a vague notion of 'culture'.

This dimension of identity construction through some 'cultural practice or participation in particular (ethnic) communities' may not necessarily and exclusively be named ethnic identity if it does not involve certain interactive relationships with 'other cultural practices', particularly some collisions with mainstream white middle class cultural norms. However, inclusion of (not solely in terms of, but in combination with) discussions on this line of identity construction analyzed through some theoretical framework that is somehow distant from post-structuralist/postmodern discourse on representation and politics of difference, seems to be required in order not to diminish the researcher's sensitivity to detail which does not neatly fit into a 'paradigmic' understanding[48] of the phenomenon of 'ethnicity'. As well, notions like 'culture' or 'cultural practice' may need to be elaborated and conceptualized in theories of identity construction in a way that demonstrates how one's subjectivity is structured and re-structured through his/her cultural activities. Approaches to the phenomenon through some theories of (cultural) practice - although I have not succeeded in finding one which I could incorporate into this study - would seem to be useful to overcome shortcomings of theoretical perspectives on identity which intentionally or unwittingly conceptualize identity construction as a (purely) ideological construct or the site of (merely) ideological contestations, which is most likely to ignore some aspects of identity construction associated with embodiment, development and perhaps fulfillment once developed from feelings, emotions, desires, visions, and in general, ways of living and participating in the immediate communities. Even so, 'ethnicity' remains a term, category or aspect which I still have difficulty situating appropriately in this alternative cultural understanding of identity construction.

---

[48] George Marcus (1986) points out that even in the works attempting to integrate "action perspectives" with "meaning perspectives", the "penchant in Western social thought for abstract, all-encompassing paradigmatic structures to theory" is still prevailing except for few works such as Bourdieu's *Outlines of a Theory of Practice* (1977) (Marcus, 1986: 169). As I read through postmodern or Cultural Studies literature on ethnicity and identity while, at the same time, trying to understand the narratives and to theorize or conceptualize the identity construction captured in them, I found that in the majority of the literature, understanding of the subject is still prevailed by this "penchant for paradigmatic" understanding of structures, resulting in a lack of concepts that can elaborate the relationships or interactive lines among materiality, human subjectivity and human activity. This partly led me to returning to my initial conceptual framework and adding a little bit of that aspect of 'cultural practice' in that chapter, although it was not sufficiently elaborated in terms of theory nor was it so effectively used in the narrative reading as it could have been.

There is another reflection which came from a direction similar to the above yet will address a different matter. At the initial reading of the narratives, heavily driven by Cultural Studies literature, I tended not to be aware that it is not only inappropriate but also dangerous to directly translate politically or pedagogically intended 'metaphors' into analytical schemes. Although, as I pointed out in chapter two, the lay, political and analytical meanings of social categories are always overlapping, inseparable and interplaying, it seems also to be important for us to read politically intended metaphors in literature with care and within their own contexts and not to dub them as either analytical concepts or contexts of lived-experience of the subjects. It seems that one is required to take even more care in reading Cultural Studies in which political metaphors and analytical concepts are deemed not to be distinct, or the distinction is deemed not to require explication. In a way, this can be seen as a critical problematic in Cultural Studies[49], although I will not explore this matter further.

The necessity of this certain distinction among analytical, political and lay meanings has brought me back to some reflection on methods of reading narratives: that is, the significance of 'ethnographic understanding' prior to 'critical analysis', or putting it differently, a need for an ethnographer to be balanced between a pull and push from participants' accounts and her own reflection on them. In warning researchers within ethnographic methodology of the difficulties of understanding, Uma Narayan (1989) nicely puts the much needed ethics of reading, or listening to, others' story in terms of "methodological humility" and "methodological caution": that is, an ethnographer must

---

[49] Capitalized 'Cultural Studies' usually refers to British Cultural Studies which has intellectual traditions and associations with the Birmingham School, although it sometimes refers to a new tradition of cultural studies in general that is critical of traditional anthropology (and greatly influenced by British cultural studies traditions).

> sincerely conduct herself under the assumption that, as an outsider, she may be missing something, and that what appears to be a mistake on the part of the insider may make sense if she had a fuller understanding of the context. [Similarly, even when she carries out her attempted criticism of the insider's perceptions, she must do it] in such a way that it does not attempt to, or even seem to amount to an attempt to denigrate or dismiss entirely the validity of the insider's point of view (Uma Narayan, cited in Britzman, 1991: 12)

In a way, this methodological humility/caution requires the ethnographer to take some 'distance' not only from her own lived-experience but also from her own epistemological stance and political commitment. Or, if it is not 'distance', putting it differently, the ethnographer, in reading the lived-experience and context of others, needs some moments of reserving the intellectual, theoretical and/or political context of her research in order to grasp 'a fuller understanding of the context' of the lived-experience of the subject.

'Power' and 'Resistance' in Methodology

Since it is very difficult to pin down or directly observe permeation or manifestation of macro power relations within more microscopic sites, it is possible to dismiss its existence when doing narrative or similar types of studies. In this sense, Foucault's notion of power[50] and resistance seems to me to be strategically and methodologically useful. While his position in a way seems to equivocate on the issue of the hegemonic and institutionalized forms of power by being less elaborative on his concept of 'dominance' than on that of 'power', I think that his concept can be useful in assisting us to observe power relationships in microscopic sites, specifically in his relation of power to sites of resistance and subordination. That is, Foucault draws our attention away from direct observation of power relations (which may be less reflected in narratives of lived experience) to the sites where subordination and resistance seem to occur, emerge, or be expressed. Smart (1985) summarizes Foucault's point as follows:

---

[50] Foucault's conception of resistance is, as Smart (1985) points out, often criticized as "'pure affirmation' that resistance lacks a foundation or 'any unique and unified agency of social change'" (132). Smart indicates that usually such critics seem to focus on Foucault's rejection of the common conception of power relationships predicated on a binary class division.

> Basically, the proposition [underlying Foucault's notion of power and resistance] is that instead of taking relations of power as the starting point for analysis, attention should be devoted to a study of resistance or, to put the matter another way, an understanding of relations of power might better be achieved through analysis of resistance and struggle. (135)

In this sense, bringing up voices from the margins can be one of the effective challenges to the invisible, yet dominant, centre as well as being critical of the denial of oppressive forms of domination. Analysis of resistance and struggle can also appropriately complicate the oversimplistic description of manifestations of power relations since, as we can observe in the presented narratives, resistance not only takes multiple forms but also is not always successfully transformed into empowerment or effective opposition. Yet, perhaps even more to the point, clearly there is no resistance unless there is a relationship of domination, an asymmetrical power relationship between the 'ethnic' and the 'white other' of the society.

Some educational discourses and issues

My (incomplete) attempt to bring the notion of culture back to the issue of ethnicity and identity did not result solely from the explanatory inadequacy of post-modern/post-structuralist theories on ethnicity and identity, which seem to allow little space to capture the materiality of cultural practice and the interactive line of (cultural) activities and identity formation. It is also situated within my political stance or belief that education (in a broad sense) should allow some spaces in which students (particularly, those visible minority children) can bring their feelings, visions, experiences, and their 'ways of being and living' not (merely) for soliciting paternalistic care (although educators' compassionate understanding is always critical and a prerequisite too) but for their active participation in society as 'citizens with properties'.

I borrowed this notion of the 'citizens with properties', which I broached in the introductory chapter, from David Lloyd's (1990) notion of the "subject without properties" which he uses to refer to - and critique - the Euro-centric notion of political subjects of 'local' cultures. Within this notion, Lloyd stipulates, all political subjects of local cultures are forced to enter into the political and cultural representations in which the Euro-centric political subjectivity as 'universal' human premise requires all other 'local' - thus, 'particular' - properties to be subjugated under the representatives of the 'universal' (or National) Culture. This process of producing "subjects without properties" - or the process of "cultural stripping" of individuals in the name of "transparent" citizens (Rosaldo, 1989), may be read in the premise of a cultural process for 'democracy' as some liberals like Joan Copjec contend:

> Democracy is the universal quantifier by which America - the 'melting pot', the 'nation of immigrants' - constitutes itself as a nation. If all our citizens can be said to be Americans, this is not because we share any positive characteristics, but rather because we have all been given the rights to shed these characteristics, to present ourselves as disembodied before the law. *I **divest** myself of my positive identity, therefore I am a citizen.* This is the peculiar logic of democracy. (Copjec, 1991: 30, emphasis added)

This American 'melting pot' view may not mirror its Canadian 'multicultural' counterpart. As comparative studies often note, Canada is well known as "an exception, being one of the few countries [in the developed western world] to attempt legal and normative regulation of its citizens' behavior when issues of multicultualism, race relations and human rights are raised, and using education as a tool to reconcile cultural diversity and conflict" (Tomlinson, 1995: 349). However, as some Canadian critics[51] illuminate, Canada can be no exception, though its particular forms and degree may differ in a comparative perspective, when it comes to the issue of hegemonic 'Culture', subordination of 'local difference', and sophisticated and subtle racism *within* the normative Nation and its (particular version of) democracy. While critiques of liberal democracy have been mounted in the past decades, the question of how we can oppose this 'cultural stripping' and (re)establish citizenship and democracy education within the framework of 'citizens with properties' remains a delicate and difficult one to be answered. I myself do not have an answer to it, but my reflections on and through this present study seem to urge me to rethink my initial understanding or stance on the debate on 'culture' and 'multi-culturalism' in relation to participatory democracy.

---

[51] For instance, Jon Young (1987) stipulates that

> [u]nderstanding these [ethnic] relations of exploitation and oppression is impossible without making sense of them in terms of "The Nation". Each and every form of ethnic, linguistic, religious, racial and, indeed, national social identity in Canada has been fabricated into a certain *nationality* through maintaining the dominance of some social identity (a certain patriarchal Englishness) against and under which "hospitable shield", all others were subordinated. (Young, 1987: 10; emphasis in original)

It is obvious that the notion of culture in multi-culturalism requires constant reconceptualization, particularly outside of its conventional usage, which functions as a categorization for differentiation, on the one hand, and, at the same time, as an explanation of a certain group of people as a totality. However, the achievement of a satisfactory conceptualization seems to be a long way off. Reflecting a prevailing liberal critique on the notion of culture in multiculturalism, for instance, Murray Wax (1993) observes that multiculturalism is based on the assumption of a "one-to-one relationship" between person and culture. Certainly, this one-to-one correspondence is a mechanistic perspective which even some fundamentalists may find too problematic to be claimed. However, on the notion of culture, liberal and radical critics alike seem to have failed to acknowledge that any project to "envision culture in dynamic terms" (Wax, 1993: 109) must depart from the very understanding that we (not only 'ethnic' but also 'non-ethnic'(sic) persons) are all participants in particular cultures (and the definite number of significant and/or immediate cultural communities can be identified in our everyday life) no matter how many multiple communities of cultural practice we may be engaged in, no matter how overlapping and intertwined those communities must be and no matter how non-deterministic and discursive their internal logic can be.

While liberal arguments on culture and multiculturalism tend to fail to see the mainstream/dominant culture as a particular (though hegemonic) form of culture (thus, which must exist not outside but inside the map of 'cultural diversity/multiculturalism'), some radical conceptualization of culture, particularly that of postmodernists, seems to me to become more or less reductionist by unwittingly assuming (contradictory to their own claims on partiality of human understanding and discursiveness of practice and history) that whatever does not manifest itself with totality does not exist at all. In some literature, even any claims on 'relational (which is opposed to both essentialism and reductionism) perspectives' seem to me to sound reductionist as they hardly conceptualize 'cultures' (or any substitutive/ alternative notions) in 'materialistic' terms.

Thus, for fear of being 'essentialist', they[52] (or we-or even I)-may still be reluctant to explore what forms and structures of culture we may have other than the single name of the 'subordinated' (although the 'collectivity' of the subordinated culture(s) is still significant and needs to be claimed). However, this should be rendered problematic as the question of (local) 'cultures' or 'properties' needs to be merged into pedagogical or political projects in relation to participatory (and transformative) democracy: Can we afford to not explicate any (cultural) 'properties' at all when we attempt to resist 'cultural stripping' which is imposed in the name of (liberal) democracy? How can we challenge the hegemonic culture(s) without not only some attempts to authorize/legitimate the very existence of 'local' cultures but also some efforts to translate them into something intelligible, learnable and viable?[53]

It is with these kinds of questions that educators in multicultural and/or antiracist education need to constantly confront themselves and others. Related to this, and within the context of this study, one of my reflections is that while there is a certain space for white middle class children to have their 'here-and-now' forms of white middle class culture (which is not necessarily 'the authentic' European or Anglo-Saxon culture) authorized or legitimized both inside and outside of schools, there is little space for 'visible minority' children, particularly those children of 'immigrants' to do the same. In the case of Korean-Canadian second generation, a certain conformity to academic credentialism (and family orientation to this) seems to enable them to find a space in school which is acceptable to them. While this conformity reflects a part of their problematic and unreflective ideologies, it also points out to us where and in what areas education in schools tends to fail to sensitively and effectively respond. That is, schools are hardly seen by these interviewees as a space where they can feel free to bring in their lived-experience, express their needs, desires and emotions, cultivate values and virtues, and learn and practice 'culture(s)'. Educators need to be aware of and act upon this possible lack of public space for the way of being and living of visible minority youth, or to borrow the term in the earlier discussion, space within the educational system for 'local' cultures to be legitimized.

---

[52] I would argue for instance, that Henry Giroux, one of the most prolific writers who is also well known as a radical educator, takes this type of position, particularly when the issue comes down to ethnicity.

[53] Perhaps, as Toh Swee-Hin pointed out in our informal conversations, we still need some affirmative sense of (ethnic) 'culture' even if only for heuristic purpose since 'ethnic minority' youth hardly have public space (curriculum, mass culture/mass media, youth culture, etc.) in which they can feel that any (crucial) parts of their ways of being, living and feeling are authorized or legitimized (or affirmed) whereas a certain dominant form of living and being is only too prevalent and salient in public spaces under the name of (universal) 'Western' traditions. 'Naming' those cultures and explicating the contents may be a necessary project for students to learn not only respect for 'other cultures' but also certain aspects of those cultures themselves, while this project, I believe, certainly requires (and is required for) simultaneous attempts to make 'the invisible centre' visible and push the very particularities of dominant cultures to the surface so that students (both of European and non-European descents) are offered some opportunities to explore them with a certain gaze of objectification and otherness, as some educators like bell hooks, I believe, are trying to do and seem to some degree to be successful in doing.

At the same time, multicultural education also needs to seek profound ways to encourage 'white' youth to explore their own cultures and to learn the diversity in their cultures. Some questions flowing from this thesis were: Is there any way to teach white (Euro- or Anglo-Saxon Canadian) students that they also have a (not "the") culture(s) and encourage them to explore this with a gaze of a certain degree of objectification and otherness? Is it possible to help them learn the 'otherness' of their own cultures? Can we help them to understand 'white middle class norm' is another particular form of culture, which certainly, and like any other forms of culture, cannot be found in all 'white middle class people' in a fully manifested form?

Finally, as emphasized particularly in the discussion of Stanley's narrative, there is an apparent lack of 'physical sites' for youth with diverse backgrounds to learn, understand and dialogue about such diversity (not only 'cultural' but also 'experiential', 'felt' and sometimes 'imposed' or 'constructed') and to seek and share some 'commonalities'. Forming certain 'cliques' itself should not be seen to be 'inherently dangerous' as some critics may accuse with descriptive words like 'separatism'[54]: as the presented narratives unravel for us, cliques can also be necessary sites for survival, resistance and empowerment[55]. However, educators need to find ways to address the lack of physical space and associated social space for bridging and communicating 'difference' since confined discourse, particularly racist discourse, as well as antagonism between groups tends to be reinforced by and reinforcing these limitations of physical boundary.

Sites for further research

Initially I did not pay much attention to the issue of the 'us/them' boundary construction in ordinary discourses on race, ethnicity and racism, particularly with regards to citizenship (one's sense of being a fully participating political/sociocultural subject) and national identity (what is "Canadian"). However, as I reflected on the narratives, I came to perceive it as one of the significant aspects to which researchers and educators, who are interested in anti-racist and/or citizenship education, may need to give more attention. From my impression on descriptions given by many interviewees about 'ethnic' or 'racial' cliques and increasing (new forms of) racism and separatism in some public school sites in Edmonton, I suspect the youth community in Edmonton is increasingly becoming structured along lines similar to what Les Back (1993) calls 'neighborhood nationalism vs. racialized nationalism': That is, it seems that "contact (as 'neighbors') between young people of various origins does not take place in a context which is autonomous from local and national ideologies" (Back, 1993: 231). Hence, not only is the growing separatism among youth as an immediately conceivable physical site in Edmonton worthy of further study, but a new kind of racism emerging and evolving around it, particularly with regards to both national and ordinary discourses on multiculturalism, immigration (or

---

[54] Instead of taking visible appearance of 'separation' as a phenomenon of significance in and for itself, we need to make an effort to comprehend the process of the separation of "minority" groups. Also, it can be noted that, as one of my research collaborators pointed out, the 'cliques' at dominant cultures' are rarely accused as 'separatism' as that of minority people is.

[55] Kival (1996) in the section entitled as "Separatism" of his book, also makes a similar point to this.

'immigrant'),[56] seems to call for more attention. Locally contextualized studies on ethnic/racial boundary construction may provide a useful ground for such studies as aforementioned.

While my focus on and approach to ethnic identity construction in this study traced the personal history/lived-experience of the narrators and thus did a kind of 'vertical' analysis, such studies could focus more on how an us/them boundary/category with regards to notions of ethnicity, race, difference, and racism is constructed within the local contexts among both white youth and visible minority youth (that is, it could perhaps be more of a 'horizontal' analysis). In such projects, some questions can be posed such as "what are the nature(s) and specificities of us/them boundary construction with reference to notions of race/ethnicity, racism, difference, and 'Canadian'?" while the answers could be approached by observing/interviewing a set of specific (youth) groups. In suggesting this, I have some particular studies in my mind such as Verkuyten et. al (1995, the context of the Netherlands) and Les Back (1991; 1993, the British context) in which wider representation systems and national discourses are taken into consideration in exploring and understanding ethnographic narratives of ordinary discourse.[57]

It seems to me that another interesting (and much needed) site for a future study is youth groups and their cultures particularly with a focus on their internal dynamics of membership and participation, for example, what are the specificities of internal regulations on membership and participation, how democratic/authoritarian, exclusive/inclusive or participatory/non-participatory are they, what are the aspects that have relevance to gender, class and race/ethnicity and/or to some particular forms of popular youth/mass culture(s) and so on. Such studies may be able to provide some grounds for understanding aspects of cultural practice of youth (and, through membership practice and participation in youth communities, what and how those youth learn about themselves, "their selves" and their social world as well as their relationship to/location in that social world, their "identity"). Learning one's identity through practice and participation seems to be often dismissed in studies focusing solely on the ideological dimension of ethnicity (especially when 'subjectivity' is not fully conceptualized in relation to intersubjectivity[58]) and draws little attention from researchers/educators despite its significant (it seems to me) pedagogical implications on citizenship and democracy (as well as perhaps multicultural) education.

---

[56] Some attention can also be given to discourses on 'old' and 'new' immigrants and possible tensions evolving around them, which seems to me not to be irrelevant to the variety of forms of racism.

[57] Also Gilroy (1987) could be one other influential reference which provides more political and theoretical arguments on this matter through discussions on a particular form of (British) racism that reproduces blackness and Englishness as mutually exclusive categories.

---

[58] See, Dreier (1993) for a brief but succinct discussions on situated subjectivity and interaction (although from a psychotherapeutic perspectives). Some may also find useful the conceptual/analytical devices for such suggested projects in Lave & Wenger (1991) and Chaiklin & Lave (eds.) (1993).

Bibliography

Ang, Ien. 1993. "To Be or Not to Be Chinese: Diaspora, Culture and Postmodern Ethnicity". *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science.* 21(1): 1-17.

Aronowitz, Stanley and Giroux, Henry A. 1991. *Postmodern Education: Politics, Culture, and Social Criticism.* Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Back, Les. 1991. "Social Context and Racist Name Calling: An Ethnographic Perspective on Racist Talk within a South London Adolescent Community". *European Journal of Inter-Cultural Studies.* 1(3): 19-38.

________. 1993. "Race, identity and nation within an adolescent community in South London". *New Community.* 19(2): 217-233.

Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise In The Sociology Of Knowledge.* New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

Berry, J. W. and Laponce, J. A. 1994. "Evaluating Research on Canada's Multiethnic and Multicultural Society: An Introduction", in Berry & Laponce (eds.) *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location Of Culture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1992. "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)", Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (Chapter III)

Bourdieu, Pierre, Jean-Claude Chamboredon, and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1991[Fr 1968]. *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Preliminaries.* Translated by Richard Nice. ed. Beate Krais. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Britzman, Deborah. 1991. *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brotz, Howard. 1980. "Multiculturalism in Canada: A Muddle". *Canadian Public Policy* 6: 41-46.

Buchignani, Norman and Letkemann, Paul. 1994. "Ethnographic Research" in Berry & Laponce (eds.) *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape.*

Burnet, Jean. 1983. "Multiculturalism 10 Years Later" in Jean Leonard Elliott (ed.) *Two Nations, Many Cultures.* Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

Chang, Elaine K. 1994. "A Not-So-New Spelling of My Name: Notes toward (and against) a Politics of Equivocation" in Angelika Bammer (ed.), *Displacements.* Bloomington: University of Wisconsin.

Chaiklin, Seth and Lave, Jean (eds.) 1993. *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cho, Hae-Joang. 1994. Constructing and Deconstructing 'Koreanness' in the 1990s in South Korea. Unpublished paper presented at the Workshop on "Configuring Minority/Majority Discourse" at East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Clifford, James and Marcus, George E. 1986. "Introduction: Partial Truths" in Clifford & Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press.

Copjec, Joan. 1991. "The unvermogende other: Hysteria and Democracy in America". *New Formations.* 14(Summer): 27-41.

Corrigan, Philip. 1987. "Race/Ethnicity/Gender/Culture: Embodying Differences Educationally. An Argument", in Jon Young (ed.) *Breaking the Mosaic: Ethnic Identities in Canadian Schooling.* Toronto: Garamond Press.

Denscombe, Martyn, 1995. "Explorations in Group Interviews: an evaluation of a reflexive and partisan approach". *British Educational Research Journal.* 21(2): 131-148.

Dreier, Ole. 1993. "Re-searching psychotherapeutic practice" in Seth Chaiklin and Jean Lave (eds.) *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Driedger, Leo. 1989. *The ethnic factor: Identity in diversity.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Ebert, Teresa. 1991. "Political semiosis in/of American cultural studies", *The American Journal of Semiotics*. 8(1-2): 113-35.

Edmonton Korean Association. 1994. *Edmonton Korean Community Directory.*

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. 1989. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy". *Harvard Educational Review*. 59(3): 297-324.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. *Ethnicity And Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives.* London&Boulder, Col.: Pluto Press.

Ferguson, Russell. 1990. "Introduction: Invisible Center" in R. Ferguson et. al. *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures.* New York: The New Museum of Contemporary Art / The MIT Press.

Fischer, Michael M. 1986. "Ethnicity and the Post-Modern Arts of Memory" in James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press.

Fiske, John. 1992. "Cultural Studies and the Culture of Everyday Life" in L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, and P. Treichler (eds.) *Cultural Studies.* New York, London: Routledge.

Flax, Jane. 1990. *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and postmodernism in the contemporary west.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fleras, Augie and Elliot, Jean L. 1992. *Multiculturalism In Canada: The Challenge of Diversity.* Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. "The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom: an interview with michel foucault" in James Bernauer & David Rasmussen (eds.), *The Final Foucault.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Frankenberg, Ruth. 1993. "Growing Up White: Feminism, Racism and the Social Geography of Childhood". *Feminist Review.* 45 (Autumn): 51-84.

Ganguly, Keya. 1992. "Migrant Identities: Personal Memory And The Construction Of Selfhood". *Cultural Studies.* 6(1): 27-50.

Garrod, Andrew et. al. 1992. *Adolescent Portaits: Identity, Relationships, and Challenges*. Boston, Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* London: MacMillan Press.

Gilroy, Paul. 1987. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: the Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson.

Giroux, Henry A. 1992. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education.* New York and London: Routledge

______________. 1994. "Doing Cultural Studies: Youth and the Challenge of Pedagogy". *Harvard Educational Review.* 64(3): 278-308.

Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.* New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Grossberg, Lawrence. 1993. "Cultural Studies and/in New Worlds" in McCarthy & Crichlow (eds.)

Hall, Stuart. 1981. "Teaching race" in A. James & R. Jeffcoate (eds.), *The School in the Multicultural Society.* London: Harper. 58-69.

_________. 1988. "New Ethnicities" in *Black Film, British Cinema. ICA Document* 7. London: ICA. 27-30.

_________. 1991a. "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity" in Anthony King (ed.) *Culture, Globalization and the World-system: Contemporary Conditions For the Representation of Identity.* 19-40.

_________. 1991b. "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities" in Anthony King (ed.) 41-68.

_________. 1991c. "Ethnicity: identity and difference", *Radical America*, 23(4): 9-20.

_________. 1994. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms" in Nicholas Dirks et. al (eds.), *Culture /Power /History : A Reader In Contemporary Social Theory.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Handler, Richard. 1988. *Nationalism and the Politics Of Culture in Quebec.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

hooks, bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics.* Boston: South End.

Hoover, Kenneth. 1980. *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hurh, Won Moo. 1980. "Towards a Korean-American ethnicity: some theoretical models". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 3(4): 444-464.

Isajiw, Wsevolod. 1990. "Ethnic-Identity Retention" in Raymond Breton et. al., *Ethnic Identity and Equality: Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jagodzinski, Jan. (Forthcoming) "The Politics of Difference: The Fate of Art in An Age of Identity Crisis"

James, Carl E. and Shadd, Adrienne. (eds.) 1994. *Talking About Difference: Encounters in Culture, Language and Identity.* Toronto: Between The Lines.

JanMohamed, Abdul and Lloyd, David. 1987. "Introduction: Minority Discourse - What is to Be Done?". *Cultural Critique.* (Fall, 1987): 5-16.

Jenkins, Richard. 1986. "Social Anthropological Models of Inter-Ethnic Relations Theory" in J. Rex and D. Mason (eds.) *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

____________. 1994. "Rethinking ethnicity: identity, categorization and power", *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 17(2): 197-223.

Keyes, C. 1976. "Towards a new formulation of the concept of ethnic group". *Ethnicity.* 3(3): 202-13.

Kivel, Paul. 1996. *Uprooting Racism: How White People Can Work For Racial Justice.* Philadelphia and Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Lather, Patti. 1991. *Getting Smart: Feminist Research And Pedagogy Within The Postmodern.* New York and London: Routledge.

Lave, Jean and Wenger, Etienne. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Li, Peter S. 1988. *Ethnic Inequality In A Class Society.* Toronto: Wall & Thompson.

________. (ed.) 1990. *Race And Ethnic Relations In Canada.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd, David. 1991. "Race under Representation". *The Oxford Literary Review.* 13: 62-94

Lopez, David and Espiritu, Yen. 1990. "Panethnicity in the United States: a theoretical framework". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 13(2): 198-224.

Marcus, George E. "Contemporary Problems of Ethnography in the Modern World System" in James Clifford and George Marcus (eds.) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, Calif.: University of California Press.

Mason, David. 1990. "A rose by any other name ... ? Categorisation, identity and social science". *New Community.* 17(1): 123-33.

McCarthy, Cameron and Crichlow, Warren. 1993. "Introduction: Theories of Identity, Theories of Representation, Theories of Race" in McCarthy and Crichlow (eds.). *Race, Identity, And Representation In Education.* New York & London: Routledge. xiii-xxix.

McLaren, Peter. 1992. "Collisions With Otherness: Multiculturalism, The Politics Of Difference, And The Ethnographer As Nomad". *The American Journal of Semiotics.* 9(2-3): 121-148.

____________. 1993. "Multiculturalism And The Postmodern Critique: Towards A Pedagogy Of Resistance And Transformation", *Cultural Studies.* 7(1): 118-146.

Min, Pyong Gap. 1991. "Cultural and economic boundaries of Korean ethnicity: a comparative analysis", *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 14(2): 225-241.

Mitchell, J. C. 1974. "Perceptions of Ethnicity and Ethnic Behaviour: An Empirical Exploration", in Abner Cohen (ed.), *Urban Ethnicity.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Moodley, Kogila. 1983. "Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 6(3): 320-332.

______________. 1985. *Race Relations & Multicultural Education.* Vancouver: Cetre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction. The University of British Columbia.

Morrow, Raymond A. 1991. "Introduction: the challenge of cultural studies to Canadian sociology and anthropology". *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology.* 28(2): 153-172.

Narayan, Uma. 1988. "Working Together Across Difference: Some Considerations on Emotions and Political Practice." *Hypatia* 3 (Summer) : 31-47

Okamura, Jonathan Y. 1981. "Situational ethnicity". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 4(4, October): 452-465.

Omi, Michael and Winant, Howard. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s.* New York: Routledge.

____________________________. 1993. "On the Theoretical Status of the Concept of Race" in M. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (eds.). 3-23.

Osajima, K. 1992. *Rethinking Asian American identity.* Unpublished paper, Department of Education, Colgate University.

Patthey-Chavez, G. Genevieve. 1993. "High School As an Arena for Cultural Conflict and Acculturation for Latino Angelios". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly.* 24(1): 33-60.

Palys, Ted. 1990. *Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives.* Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada Inc.

Reitz, Jeffrey and Breton, Raymond. 1994. *The Illusion of Difference: Realities of Ethnicity in Canada and the United States.* Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.

Roman, Leslie G. 1993. "White is a Color!: White Defensiveness, Postmodernism, and Anti-racist Pedagogy" in C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (eds.). 71-88.

Rosalo, Renato. 1989. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis.* Boston: Beacon.

Rosenau, Pauline M. 1992. *Post-modernism And The Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, And Instrusions.* Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.

Ruiz, Lester E. J. 1994. "Toward a New Radical Imaginary: Constructing Transformative Cultural Practices". *Alternatives*. 19: 247-261.

Rutherford, Jonathan. 1990. "The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha". in Jonathan Rutherford (ed.) *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishert.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

_________. 1986. *After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives*. New York: Pantheon.

Sanger, J. 1995. "Five Easy Pieces: the deconstruction of illuminatory data in research wrting". *British Educational Research Journal*. 21(1): 89-95

Sarup, Madan. 1989. *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*. Athens: The University of Greorgia Press.

Seif, Bishara. 1984. *Mother Tongue Usage Within Korean Families*. M.Ed. Thesis. University of Alberta.

Silverman, David. 1989. "Six rules of qualitative research: A post-romantic argument". *Symbolic Interaction*. 12(2): 215-230.

Simon, Roger. 1987. "Being Ethnic/Doing Ethnicity: A Response to Corrigan" in Jon Young (ed.) *Breaking the Mosaic: Ethnic Identities in Canadian Schooling*.

Simon, Roger and Dippo, Donald. 1986. "On Critical Ethnographic Work". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. 17: 195-202.

Smart, Barry. 1985. *Michel Foucault*. London and New York: Routledge.

Smith, Paul. 1988. *Discerning the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Statistics Canada. *1991, Census Canada*.

Strauss, Anselm and Corbin, Juliet. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sultana, Ronald G. 1995. "Ethnography and the Politics of Absence" in P.L. McLaren & J. Giarelli (eds.) *Critical Theory and Educational Research*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Thernstrom, Stephan, Ann Orlov, and Oscar Handlin. 1980. 'Introduction' (pp. v-ix) in S. Thernstrom et. al. (eds.) *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups.* Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Tomlinson, Sally. 1995. "Cultural diversity and schooling (Review article)". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 18(2): 348-354.

M. Verkuyten, W. de Jong and C. N. Masson. 1995. "The construction of ethnic categories: discourses of ethnicity in The Netherlands". *Ethnic and Racial Studies.* 18(2): 251-276.

Walcott, Harry. 1988. "Problem Finding' in Qualitative Research". in Henry T. Trueba and Concha Delgado-Gaitan (eds). *School & Society: Learning Content Through Culture.* New York: Westport Connecticut and London: Praegar.

Wallman, Sandra. 1979. "Introduction: The Scope for Ethnicity" in S. Wallman (ed.), *Ethnicity at Work.* London: Macmillan.

______________. 1986. "Ethnicity and the boundary process in context", in D. Mason and J. Rex. (eds.), *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinfeld, Morton. 1994. "Ethnic Assimilation and the Retention of Ethnic Cultures" in Berry & Laponce (eds.) *Ethnicity and Culture in Canada: The Research Landscape.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Williams, Brackette F. 1989. "A CLASS ACT: Anthropology and the Race to Nation Across Ethnic Terrain". *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 18: 401-44.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning To Labour.* Hants. England: Saxon House.

Worsley, Peter. 1984. *The Three Worlds: Culture & World Development.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Young, Jon. (ed.) 1987. *Breaking the Mosaic: Ethnic Identities in Canadian Schooling.* Toronto: Garamond Press.

Appendix A : Group Interview

June 16, 1995

Participants: Eric, Stanley, Jeffrey, Ralph

Int: Let's talk about anything, any experiences, thoughts, or feelings you may have in relation to your "being Korean".

E: We are going to talk about ... what?

I: Talk about ... anything.

E: Anything? Talk about ... girls? (laugh)

I: Well ... if you want to ... if you have anything to talk to us.

E: Well ... seriously. It's funny, though, cause, hum. O.K. So while we're talking about the culture thing, that's what we're talking about. Isn't that what we're talking about? It's funny because like for a lot of Korean guys like from what I've seen, right, like, liking white girls right? But, when they get older they find Korean girls more attractive.

I: Really? Why?

E: Yeah, I don't know.... I saw it. It's just an observation. I see it in a lot of people. I think it's true. I think it's like when you get older like I guess as you identify yourself with being Korean, right, you find, I don't know, you find it more comfortable and stuff .

S: But, that's just you know conforming to your parents' wills, you're past....

E: No. No. It's not about parents and stuff. Like I mean your parents of course want you to marry Koreans and stuff, right? But, like I think I would......

I: You feel comfortable because.... Is it because Korean girls fit more to your norm or expectation of ...

E: I don't know. (S: You can relate to them more). Yeah, you can relate to them. And they're prettier too. (laugh)

E: I don't know. Like even like music too. Like for some people you look people at Ainley right? Like they have a lot of hum kids from Korea who just came a couple years ago or some ... thing and they bring all this stuff right? And then even people who were born here they find it kind of suited for their taste I guess (S: Hey, what are you talking about?). I'm talking about ... like *Kim Kun-mo.*[1] (J: Yeah, *Kim Kun-mo.*) It's really weird though. When you're young and stuff, I think that a lot of people go through the denial stage like I'm not Korean and I act white you know. Seriously act like white. But, it's kind of weird though. You know, you'd expect someone who's born here to test that sort of stuff because I don't know but then I see a lot people who like that stuff.

S: And then there's people like Jeffrey who don't like that stuff.

E: I know. I'm not saying ...

S: But, you went to Korea and you were born there.

E: I'm just saying from what I'm seeing from Jeffrey's schools. I'm not saying everyone....

R: I think that that's the cool thing to do right now. It's trendy.

S: It's trendy.

I: Is it just trendy? Do you like them because it's trendy? Or, do you feel more association with those ... Korean songs, or Korean girls .....

R: With girls, I don't think it's trendy.

---

[1] Korean pop singer.

(laugh)

I think with music it's the cool thing to do right now.

E: Yeah, but, you guys find it uncool though.

S: If I heard of a band that was first generation Canadian-Korean band that sang in English, oh man, would I ever like it. That would be cool. I'd listen to that.

E: No. It would have to be good to be cool. Just because they're Korean, it doesn't mean, oh, that's cool.

S: Yeah, but then....

E: OK. Yeah, how about that guy what's his name? [U.T.] for the Dodgers. He's cool, right. Yeah, but then, the thing is, why is he cool. He's not that good, but he's cool. [U.T.] Yeah, we find that cool because we have that certain association, right?

J: Oriental.

S: Yeah, because we feel a bond.

E: Yeah, exactly.

S: But, the issue is if I heard a white guy singing Korean music, a Western singer, I wouldn't like it. Like regardless if they were Korean or white the music is just not your taste. It's just not there for me.

E: I'm not saying everyone ...

S: No. But, Eric, I think you find an association with Korean music not just because it's good but because ..

E: No. Things like music, it's all personal taste right. Because I don't find some of the groups you guys like to my taste at all. So I mean it's all personal taste obviously.

I: Don't you think you like it because you understand the words?

E: Yeah, probably.

Many: But, many people don't understand the words.

J: I don't understand!

I: Then, why do you like them?

J: I don't know .... It's *Ye-Bbeo*[2].

E: They don't understand the words but they still like it. But, you know.... Some with Chinese girls, they don't know what they mean but they like it ... It sounds pretty.

S: I think you just relate to it.

E: No, I know. I like , like, mellow stuff. It's all personal taste. I don't find Tragically Hip all that interesting to me..... Really silly, it's really shallow - pure shallow.

S: Not really. It represents your personality.

E: Music?

S: Music is just a language with no barriers you know.

E: What else I find interesting is ... I know some people ... like they're Koreans, right? And they actually despise other Koreans. Like ____ (a name is mentioned).

R: I don't think they despise Koreans. You don't know the real story.

E: But, things like, a lot of people like a lot of Koreans for example go through that stage where they say, like, man I don't want to be Korean.

S: When you're a kid. Real kid.

---

[2] A Korean word which means 'pretty', 'beautiful', and/or 'lovely'.

E: Yeah, but even then, some people that carries on

S: ... like then they get older.

I: Still there seem to be some people who haven't had such a period at all. Some of the people I interviewed said they haven't had any problem at all. They said they know part of their identity is Korean and they accept it without any difficulties. They said the processes as well as experiences have been a kind of smooth.

S: Well, because when I was a kid and you go through kindergarten and English and everything and you have like English speaking friends and everything and then your parents impose Korean school and eating Korean food and all that stuff. Then, it's natural to reject what your parents want you to do and so that's Korean heritage so I rejected it.

I: You don't even eat *Kimchee*[3]?

S: I still don't eat *Kimchee*.

E: So how come you're not like that now?

I: Yeah, what has been changed? What has made you change?

S: Well, I don't know. For me any ways hum the Koreans I know personally because I share so many more common bonds with Koreans because in my school in Suburban A. where it's majority white, there's a tendency, I'm not saying everyone's the same, but there's a tendency for people to basically, when they get to a certain age, it's just, either it's school, work or party. There's not really too much depth to friendships. But what I found with these people here your friendships go way beyond anything. It's not just what are you going to do Friday night. It's just you spend time together and we share interest such as church. We share that common belief just anything right. It's just easier to relate to Koreans because you can talk about similar episodes of what your parents did you know. Your parents are similar you talk about that sort of stuff. You just can't do that with your white friends like they're find and all, but it's just like the bond is not there.

I: Then, what about oriental or Asian friends other than Koreans, like Chinese or East Indians.....

S: Well, the younger kids in our group, the grad tens their...they seem to be....right now they're at the Chinese church...

R: It's because there are more girls. (laugh)

S: Well, yeah. One of the guys here is going because of his Chinese girlfriend and they're more open to other races now too which is good.

E: I think people find it more comfortable, for us to be associated with Asians than other groups like I guess, even at school. I don't have that many Korean friends. I associate with Asians more. I don't know, I think I find it more comfortable.

S: At school, I don't have that many Asian friends, but see in a way, that's racist because you associate first, I don't know if you do first...

E: No, but the thing is I experience all their, I spend time with them then after I have a tendency to associate with Asians because I find it more comfortable.

S: Yeah, so let's say you met a new group of people, right? And there were Asians and there were non-Asians. Who would you tend to [U.T.] towards?

E: Oh, yeah, well, that's like in your self-conscious though, you can't help it.

S: Exactly. That's racism built in.

E: Yeah, exactly, but ...

R: I don't think that's racism.

---

[3] Korean style cabbage pickle.

S: Racism is where you see races first and not the person see.

E: Yeah, but, then everybody's racist though right? Everyone is.

S: Yeah. But, if you see a person you shouldn't see their color.

E: Yeah, but you can't help it because it just happens.

S: Yeah, but then you have to acknowledge that because you can't base on race because....

E: Yeah, we know it, but it just happens.

R: It's just like when you're describing a person.

S: Yeah, see. It's built in.

E: Yeah, exactly.

S: So should we just take it away?

E: No, but you have to understand that that's a part of racism. But that shouldn't prevent you from getting to know other people per se. It shouldn't prevent you from reaching out, but I'm saying it's there. But, it's not necessarily a bad thing because if you know it and you understand it then you know that in a way it could lead to extremes and it could lead to, you know, wrong values. But, if you know it, then I think it's okay.

S: But, if you know it and you choose to ignore it then, it will lead to misleading. Because.... there are people who maybe like Korean supremacist or whatever. Or, Asian supremacist or whatever.

E: Yeah, but that's extreme though to a certain extent.

S: Yeah, but how can we rationalize it though? Racism .... which is a wrong thing I think. You know. We're supposed to be colorless, sexless, and you know.

E: Exactly, Stanley. But, human nature says that you can't help it. Yeah, I Mean it's in there. It's built in. You can't help it. It's just there.

S: No.

E: I mean you can't try to fix everything, I mean.... You'd be lying you'd be a hypocrite if you said you could try to fix it.

S: Yeah, but you know there's people who have thoughts about killing people and it all depends on what you do with those thoughts that matter and you know there racist thoughts, you know, start to a flake some actions.

E: Exactly. You know, it's up to the individual to decide which is right and which is wrong.

S: Yeah, but if you're in a manager type position or like a higher position.......

E: That's discrimination.

S: Well, yeah, but you're discriminating between on race and another.

E: No, that's different. From my example is when ... from my experiences right, I tend to associate better with Asians, but that's not going to prevent me from the future with associating with white people or other ethnic groups.

S: But, you're leaning ....

E: No, but from my experience. All my friends are basically, mostly Asians because I associate with them better. But, I'm not saying that in the future, I'm never going to have any white friends.

S: Well, yeah. That's what I'm saying. I'm not saying that's what's going to happen but you're leaning because you're seeing in colors like..... " I hate their clothes and.......

E: Yeah, OK, then but if you know, if you have a tendency to associate with Asians and you try to associate with white people then you'd be lying. You'd be lying to yourself because you know if you kind of force it upon yourself you kind of ....

I: Well, all could depend on the situations. You may associate with Korean more in some cases, but more with other people in other cases. With some people you may feel more comfortable no matter what color they are....

E: Yeah, I'm not saying ... I'm not generalizing...

S: And I'm not accusing you. (laugh)

E: I'm just saying that's from my experience ... that's just....

S: But, the thing is racism comes from experiences.....

E: I know. That's racism you call it that, but you have to admit everyone's like that.

(pause)

S: I'd like to go on .... I mean ..... I just have a problem with, if you way well I know there's something kind of vaguely racial in your mind, and you should be, I see people whatever and everyone should have equal opportunity you know. Afterward you can have your preference, right ....

E: Well, Stanley. You have a preference too.

S: I know, well, yeah.

E: That's what I mean.

S: It's built in....

E: Yeah, well, why don't you try to hang out with your white friends more?

S. I do.

E: See. Exactly. You'd be lying to yourself, if you say this guy's my best friend when he's not. You'd be lying to yourself.

S: But, I'm not saying. I know .... I recognize that I get along with Asians better.

E: Exactly. OK. So you recognize that but if you refuse to admit that then you're lying.

S: No. But, I'm not refusing. I'm saying that's true right? I'm saying that's true right now and you should also say that .... if two people came up to me one Asian and one White ... each person, I'm going to give them an equal chance. It shouldn't be like I see the Asian person and lean in towards them. But you might have a tendency to do that because of your experience. Because of your experience, you're like I have a tendency to get along with Asians, I'll try this way and you're going to try to get along with that person just because of your previous experience, whereas the white person is I usually don't get along with them too. Well, you're going to try to avoid them. Looking at it from one extreme, so you know that's like picking favorites whereas it should be like each person should get an equal, you know ... and if you have there tendencies towards one race.....

E: But, I'm saying what there tendencies come from.... Like I'm not saying .... I don't know if I'll have such like favoritism when I look at two different people that I've never met. What I'm saying from what I've experienced I get along with Asians better..... It might......

S: You might be faced in a situation when you have two people like that and it should be either one. It shouldn't be, well, from previous experience, you got to watch out for that because if you're in a hiring position, let's say, and then you choose, just because, in the back of your mind without consciously thinking it's in the back of your mind you know.... if it's rooted, you got to be aware of that. I wouldn't want to be judged, you know, that's the whole basis of racism. You see in terms of races instead of the qualifications in what the actual persons themselves. If you see color first then that's racism without a doubt. So then I see a person, it shouldn't be Korean, white, you know, Chinese, East Indian, it should just be a person, right?

(small talk, laugh)

I: So basically, Stanley, you think too much association with Asians or Koreans based on ethnic or racial group identification is no good, don't you?

S: It might cause you're leaning toward one group, I'm not saying everyone should have an equal amount of each race.....

(pause)

I: Stanley, you once raised the issue of "identity" last time in our discussion, saying you used to hang around with white friends, but now you tend to hang around with more Koreans or Asians because you find them help you build or understand your identity. Can you talk a little more about that?

S: Oh, yeah. When you're a kid, I was trying to fit into a group that was there which was only majority right? And Koreans, I don't know, I don't want to get all figurative but I saw it as Koreans kind of represent my parents and my family and I didn't want any part of my culture. Culture's a bad thing when you're a kid, right? I think to everyone so I tend to hang around with white kids, which was in a way a rebellion. My parents were always like, why don't you hang out with Korean kids or cousins and stuff, but I wanted to hang out with the white kid. And then, as I grew older through because I wanted to find out who I was myself and I can't deny that I'm Korean, right? So, I got to explore that and when I was a kid I never explored that cause no kids explore, but now that I'm older I'm trying to like backtrack a little and find out who I am and finding people who are like me. It is helping you know to find yourself by seeing other people because they're so close to you and that's why I'm deviating to here to find out. If not, it's not just because like personalities I get along with these people - that's part of it but also in my selfish way to find out something about myself through these other people - identity with these other people which helps me find my identity and in a way I think it's brought me closer to my parents - just because you hang out with Koreans. But in, on the other hand, I'm getting away from my white friends which might be a bad thing because I went from there and almost made a complete transition to Koreans. Like almost in one year, I went from one to the other. Now I'm getting some strange talk....

R: Some heat...

S: Some heat from my white friends.

I: Like what?

S: Like stuff like, "you like your other friends better!"

R: yeah, "you never hang out with us anymore".

S: Cause we're in a situation where we're in our little Northern Pole, right? And we have our white friends here and we worked on these basis - we worked with our white friends for so many years - we worked hard at it right? And then all of a sudden we start to find this other thing we're like "oh" and then we spend more time over here. And then just through technicalities like we came here, we don't want to go back and forth, we stay here, right? And then we're like, "this is great! We'll spend more time here and then these white friends are like "you're dissing us", as Ralph would put it "and you're not hanging out with us anymore" - my friends see it as you like them better - you have more fun with them - these guys here. But, that's not true. In a way, it's true, but I also identify with them better, right?

E: Yeah, but you do have more fun, don't you?

S: Well, I do. Yeah. But, I can't deny that I had some with them too. But, also there's a third side of this coin, I don't know how coin can have its third side .... but my friends back home all they do some things that I do, but the majority of time, it's a lot of just parting, drinking, and club hopping and that's not really my thing.

I: Your thing? What is it then?

S: My thing is like .... just ... well, we don't do much of anything ... just ... whatever it is, it shouldn't be what you're doing. It's just the people who you're with and your true friends are the people who you could just be sitting there - you can just sit there and do nothing and be completely content. You shouldn't be like, let's do something cause you're - you can't stand to be with these people, it's like you have to go out and do something with them. But, if I'm with these guys, you can just sit there and do nothing and it's okay. And that's kind of a true sign of friendship then. I have fun with them and so that's why I can identify with these people. These people? ..... my friends whereas it was harder in Suburban A..

I: So what do you think all this will lead you to?

S: Well, I think my parents are planning a trip for me to Korea in, like, a year, right? And Eric has been to Korea and he thinks it'll be like life changing for us and I think Ralph might be going to Korea or something.

R: I might not be, I don't know.

S: It might be .... but I'm thinking it might be life changing I don't know. There's not enough time - you have to absorb Korean culture and it's going to change cause I saw a change in Eric when he came back for sure. So...

E: It depends on the person, like in my ....

S: But, I think you were looking for change too. Yeah, cause you were changed, you did, weren't you? I think that period up to when you went to Korea and Korea .....

E: I don't know.

S: I don't know. But, I think I'll change. But, I realize you can't just jump from one place to another. You can't do that. You can't.... It's like moonlighting. You go to school with them on Friday nights you go here. It's like taking them for granted, you use them at school , then you begin to hang out with your real friends, code and code...

E: Yeah, for me I don't put much effort in keeping associations.

R: Yeah, with school friends.

E: I know it sounds kind of selfish, but I don't really care cause I figure, in your life, you're only going to have a couple of good friends cause for me I don't think I'm that big social type of person. So for me as long as I have a small group of friends who I feel really comfortable with and I'm okay. I'm satisfied, so I don't really care if my school friends don't like me or whatever.

R: I don't put too much effort into making really good friends at school ... but it's like, uh, what if I don't have any friends - you're walking on a fine line.

E: So everybody's alone anyway....

M/R: Eric, shut up (laugh).

E: No, it's true. Everybody's alone.

S: What is alone....?

(pause, laugh, small talk)

I: Is it a kind of homesick?

E: [U.T.] homeland.

E: But, I'm looking forward to it. I'd be lying if I said I'm not looking forward to going back to Korea, cause I'm going back this summer for my sister's wedding, for a visit, but I'm looking forward to it cause the wedding and stuff and I'm going traveling and stuff.

E: I think in a way, I think we're lucky for being second generation Koreans .... I don't know. It's like 1.5 generation or whatever cause, I mean, yeah, you get the best of both worlds - cause you know what's out there right? So you take whatever is there. I think I'm lucky cause I have like both aspects of societies.

I: But, don't you sometimes find any conflict between those two worlds?

E: I really don't, personally, I don't. No.

E: I don't find it hard to deal with both ... For me, anyway.... I think I'm kind of lucky cause you know ... you can be both. You can hang out with people ....

I: Do you think you can have both even when values between two worlds conflict one another in a way? Do you mean things like, you can be independent while not being too individualistic and still very much caring about other people around you? Things like that?

E: I think so .... I don't know ... It's hard to answer. For me, I don't want to be classified as being this way or this way. But I think I know enough in my head that I can be my own person by taking both. Some parts of both and that makes me, sort of put it, more complete in my point of view. Cause I'm not just leaning towards this way and I'm not just leaning towards that way.

S: You get the best of both worlds.

E: Exactly. That's what I think though.

I: So you have no trouble with taking both worlds?

E: Yeah, I've had no trouble with it. Yeah, I get sometimes, like, smart comments from these guys. I have no problem with it ....

(All laughed)

E: You know. When you guys get anti-Korean sometime. You say you know Korean music sucks .... blah blah blah ... you know, I have no problem. And you say oh Eric when you come back from Korea you're going to be like all this and you're going to play.... I'm not ...

R: We never say that.

E: Yeah, you do.

J: We just say you're going to spend too much time with your wife or something.

(laugh)

E: And then you guys say that I'm leaning towards Korean. You guys said that I've become more distant, right? But, I don't think I have .... because ....

S: We have to be more distant because if you're starting to take from another culture.

E: Yeah, but can't you take both and put it together?

S: Yeah, but by taking both, you have to take away from one...You can't...

E: No ... You can take what's there and put it together.

S: Yeah, but you only have so much time and so much interest. You know you have a bowl of water and you take two cups, right? You can't all of a sudden add more water to make up for what you lose in one cup.

Everybody: Woo.... What? (laugh)

S: Because you only have so much to work with. You only have so much time and energy and what not. You can spend with one thing or the other. One culture or the other, right? And if you spend a lot of time and energy in one culture or let's say one ___(?) here, right? Then, you start to deviate to Korean things, you have to take away from one in order to have more time for the other. You have to. You can't just make new time and new interest to all of a sudden get into this Korean stuff. You have to take away from what you had before to get to this new thing .... Yeah, cause you're trying to get more Korean stuff, right? So you're going to deviate ... Let's take music. You're going to take a lot of your musical interest and you're going to more towards Korean. Let's take your friends. You use to have, let's say you move to Koreans. You have to have time for your Korean friends, too.

E: You know about music. It's true.

R: For Korean music, you gave up everything. Like when you left for Korea last summer, you liked “Sarah”, “Smashing Pumpkins”, blah, blah, blah...

E: Yeah, but that’s different though. That’s music.

E: OK. If you say .... how about this then. You use to like ABC, but you found this new thing. You never listen to ABC before you use to go to something else, but that’s not because it’s different culture cause you find this more liking to your taste. So it’s not just because of culture. It’s all that ......

I: Do you mean it’s just matter of individual’s taste?

E: Yeah, I think it’s a matter of taste. In terms of music, it’s personal difference ....

S: But, let’s say.... Like your white friends. Let’s say you used to spend a certain amount of time with them and then you wanted to move toward a more Korean thing just because that’s more to your liking.

E: I don’t think it’s because I wanted to .... It just happened because ...

S: You could be [U.T.]. You could have moved with them with whatever they were doing. Let’s say they were moving in a certain direction. You could have chosen to move in the direction with them, but, instead, you chose to go in a different direction which meant that you had a different mindset than these guys.

E: Yeah, but, it’s just not because I don’t think it’s because of culture. It’s because they lean towards parting and stuff. And they lean into going out and drinking and stuff, but I’m not into that so... I ... I guess it’s okay if you want to call that in terms of interest, right? But, I mean it just happens cause - I don’t know. Who knows? Maybe I’ll find someone like someone who’s white and maybe he’ll be my best friend. Maybe ...

I: Maybe even your wife...

E: Yeah, but, right now I find a certain group of people - from what I’ve experienced.

-- The End --

Appendix B: Sally

June 5, 1995

(Sally agrees to the confidentiality and right to withdraw her comments later)

I: Do you feel comfortable?

S: Yes, I feel comfortable.

I: To begin with, could you describe yourself a little bit? Things like your personality, your interests and so on.

S: Most people, everybody, thinks I'm shy so .... because I'm quiet and sensitive. In some ways I'm sort of independent though. What I like is movies and reading. I like to read. You know what every teenager likes to do so ....

I: Well, reading doesn't seem to be what every teenager likes to do. (laugh)

S: Well, I'm a different teenager. (laugh)

I: What kind of movies or books do you like?

S: I like all sorts [of movies] like adventure or horror, romance ...... I like to read novels, chapter books....

I: Could you describe a little bit about your family?

S: Hum, my family is different.

I: What do you mean?

S: Well, my Dad is tough in sort of ways .... like for instance we're going back home .... before packing we had to pay ten dollars for each person for tax or something and altogether it came out to forty dollars. My Dad got really mad and he was swearing and stuff like that. Why do we have to pay? We're just passing through. My Dad's like that so .... he gets mad [U.T.]. My mom, she's weird. Sometimes she can be mean when she's mad, she can be crazy and fun. That's what I like about her. My brother ... we have a lot of fights. He's always making me confused... we fight about weird things like for instance, for instance, he says, yes this is what it is and I'll say no it isn't ... so we're fighting and I get mad at him ... I really want to choke him or something.

I: Are your parents a kind of strict?

S: They used to be when I was younger. But, then, they began to be looser as I grew up because I wasn't a baby no more.

I: What about school? Do you like it?

S: Sometimes. And sometimes not because when it's really boring and they give too much homework and when I'm too tired, I just want to go to sleep and not do work. Sometimes yeah, it's OK like it. I like it sometimes like when there's a lot of activities going on like spare week and .... yeah ...

I: What about friends? Getting along with friends, making friends.....

S: Well, it was sort of hard and easy kind of in the beginning of the year. And then as the year progressed, it became hard sort of because we have all these conflicts between us and like we fight about things ... yeah I guess .... nobody really get along, like, sometimes we get really good and sometimes not so...

I: Could you tell me a little bit about your friends?

S: Some of my friends are crazy, wild and weird. Other ... some of my friends are sensitive and quiet and you know good people ...

I: Do you also have Korean friends?

S: My best friend is Korean so ... and I have another best friend who's from Korea, so ....

I: Do you have any other close friends who are not Korean?

S: Yeah.

I: What kind of ethnic background do they have?

S: Probably English, yeah. They're from Europe.

I: Do you go to church?

S: Yeah, every Sunday.

I: What church?

S: Korean ... Roman Catholic ....

I: Do you also have friends there?

S: Not really... because some of them I really don't like because they're so different. I'm sort of wild and totally bad and they're like weird ...

I: In what way?

S: I have a couple of, one or two friends there ....

I: In what way are they weird?

S: I dress differently, they dress ... I don't know why, but, there's a couple of people who dress like me there and they're like me and I've become friends with them. I don't know how to describe it when I say weird .....

I: Does it mean that you don't feel comfortable with them?

S: Right.

I: Were they mostly born in Canada?

S: I think so ... some of them were born in Korean and came to Canada ... so they're not like me born in Edmonton, so ....

I: Have you ever been asked where you are from?

S: Yeah, many times, like they say "Where are you from?" and I say I'm from South Korea but I was born here I tell them. Mostly they say that since I'm a South Korean they think I was born in South Korea and I say no I was born here ... Just like you [indicating the people who asked].

I: Who are they?

S: Like people from my class and some people from out of class...

I: You mean in school?

S: Yeah, in school mostly ...

I: Do you sometimes identify yourself as Korean?

S: Pardon?

I: Do you identify yourself as Korean?

S: Yeah, I guess so.

I: If you do then what is that? What does "being Korean" mean to you?

S: I don't know.

I: Just because your parents came from Korea?

S: Well, when I say that I am Canadian also, I am Korean-Canadian. That means to me that I am half Canadian because I was born here and I speak their language and eat their food. When I say I'm Korean cause I look like Korean, I can speak Korean and I come from Korean people, so ...

I: How did you feel when you were asked where you are from? Were you upset?

S: Sometimes, sometimes not cause people want to know where I'm from and, so I tell them, I'm from South Korea but I was born here. I tell them because I don't want them to get the wrong idea that I'm something else. Sometimes I get mad because they keep on asking me or something like that, then I get mad because ... I don't know.

I: You don't want them to get the wrong idea?

S: Parden?

I: I mean you said .... what ... you don't want them to think you are something else?

S: ... Just as a different person.

I: What if you meet somebody who is different in terms of skin color or whatever? Would you ask them?

S: Sometimes, but I can tell Asians .... I can tell which one is which, like Chinese are different. They're ... well, it's weird ... I can tell which one is which, like I can tell that you're Korean ... and other times I can tell other people are Filipino or Japanese because it's weird. I can tell how they do stuff, how they act ....

I: Actually, I can't really tell you are Korean. You don't look like Korean.

S: Me?

I: Could you describe a little bit about your school?

S: Well, my school's old, like about twenty years old. I like ... well, it's really crowded ... lots of people go to their lockers and get their stuff and it's neat cause in elementary you don't have to go to your locker and do something but in junior high it's fun sort of, like an adventure so it's fun.

I: Do you have many Korean students in your school?

S: Not really. In my grade there's like me and this other girl. In grade 10, there's like two or three and in grade 9 there's one.

I: How many students are there in your school?

S: Around five hundred. Just junior high.

I: Do you have any vision for your future, like what you want to do or to be?

S: Yeah, sometimes. I want to be an eye doctor or I want to be international in law. And sometimes I would say I want to be what I look like.

I: I'm sorry I didn't get your last statement.

S: Well, like, I like to dream about what I would look like and what would I do and stuff.

I: What do you think Korean culture is?

S: I think, what I think about Korea is that Korean people are unique ... and Korea is well, sort of , different like .... Korean s eat *Kim-Chee* and other cultures don't eat that and I think that it's neat that we have something of our own ... not something that we borrowed from another country.

I: Do you eat *Kim-chee*?

S: Yeah, of course!

I: Some young Korean-Canadians don't eat Kim-chee.

S: Yeah, they think it's too hot or something ....

I: What about Korean tradition that you can find in your family? Can you identify any?

S: Like how they act or something like that? Well, for New Years before when I was young I had to dress up in that Korean dress and then I would go to my elders, aunts and uncles, and I bowed to them. I think that's cool. And when we have a birthday my mom says that we have to make that seaweed soup, *Miyokkuk* ....

I: Do you know the reason?

S: No.

(some conversation about the soup)

I: Have you ever had a bad experience in relation to your being Korean or, being Oriental?

S: Hum ... very little time. Once my family we were driving to Vancouver and we stopped by Kelowna because it was night and we wanted to sleep so we were stopping by hotels. There are lots of hotels in Kelowna but most of them were not vacant but we went to one and the guy goeS: no sorry the sign's broken, there's no more rooms. And after Dad came of that hotel two English people went in and the sign went to No Vacancy. Then I got mad because just because we're Korean doesn't mean ... he doesn't have the right to lie to us. So I got pretty mad and then we went to the hotel ...{some description about the hotel they later found}... and we were lucky.

I: Do you think lot about your being Korean?

S: Well, not really ...

I: Does it sometimes bother you?

S: It doesn't bother me. I'm proud to be Korean. No. It doesn't bother me.

I: Do you see anything in you that you can call something that is Korean?

S: What do you mean by that?

I: Well, I don't know... I'm just wondering, because you said you're proud to be Korean ... and ... so I wonder what it means to you to be Korean ... I wonder if there is anything else that makes you feel being Korean, other than, as you said, you look like Korean or whatever ... like you said earlier ...

S: Well .... I don't know.

I: Some of the people I interviewed said they used to hang around with non-Korean friends when they were young, but then as they got older, they tend to hang out with Koreans more. What about you?

S: Well, most of my friends are white and they hang around with Asian people. And since there aren't many Koreans in my school, they hang around with Chinese people. So most of my friends are Chinese and English.

I: Do you feel comfortable with them?

S: Yeah, I feel comfortable with them.

-- The End --

Appendix C : Samantha

July 4, 1995

(The why and the wherefore of the thesis are introduced. Also the participant's rights in the research process are explained.)

I: I know you can speak Korean, but the interview will be done all in English. If any of my questions is not clear to you, then please do not hesitate to ask me back and clarify it.

S: (laugh) I don't speak Korean fluently. I lost a bit of my Korean after going to school and stuff you kinda around English more so.

I: Well, I sometimes feel embarrassed when I have to talk in English especially when I talk to Korean-Canadians in English. I guess it's mainly because my English is not fluent but, I feel even more embarrassed and nervous when talking with Korean-Canadians in English maybe because most of them are bilingual and I feel like they might think, "well, you'd better speak in Korean to me. Then, I'll understand you better" (laugh)

S: I feel kind of embarrassed when I talk to my aunts and uncles and my Grandma cause I can't speak Korean, (but?) I can understand, cuz, some of my Korean friends at school can speak much better than me because they go to church. Our family hasn't been going to church for awhile so they're at least around, maybe once a week or something, and their parents are more at home. It's kind of embarrassing sometimes when they are joking around or talking in Korean and I'm just sitting there. I just don't fully understand them...

I: But, haven't you attended Korean language school at all?

S: No. I mentioned to my Dad a few months ago that I wanted to go to Korean school cuz it was really bugging me that didn't know that much so I don't know I might. So when I go I'll probably be with all little kids but I was thinking about it because I want to learn Korean.

I: Why is it bugging you?

S: I don't know. Before it didn't really bother me because I didn't think...oh you know I know enough to get by...especially with my Grandma and sometimes she'll make fun of us because we don't know...

I: Are you living with your Grandma?

S: We used to, but she is living in an apartment now, but we see her often, so.... But it's funny we used to joke around and stuff and it would be nice knowing a little more.

I: Well, you can have a chance in the future, especially if you go to college. Are you going to go to college?

S: Yeah, I'm trying to, I'm going to summer school right now so I'm going to see what happens and then...

I: That might be the time you have the chance to go to Korea or...

S: My cousin in university is taking Korean 101. He's learning a little bit like that and I think he might be going to Korea too...to do something.

I: Can you describe a little bit about yourself? Your personality, you interest, and so on.

S: As you can tell I like sports (pointing the pictures on the wall). I've been playing volleyball since grade 8 and I've been running since, doing track, since grade 3 or 4 maybe. I like running and playing volleyball lot so I like sports. My parents think it takes away from my academic school life, but for me, I keep telling them that one of the things for me that makes me want to go to school is to go to practice and play the games and it's something I can look forward to. When I think of sports I think of school and that kind of keeps me going and if I didn't do the sports then I probably wouldn't do anything. But I guess I love sports and like doing sports and stuff. I like listening to music. I don't really like any specific kind, see me being the youngest I wait for my sister and brother to buy their CDs and I don't have to use my money. So whatever they bring back I listen to and I like spending time with my friends. It's good because we have, in my group of friends there's a lot of different ethnic, like my best friend is East Indian, Punjabi. She's right here (shows picture) I've known her since grade one and we've gone to the same school since grade 1 and we've been best friends for five years. We've known each other for 16-17 years but we've become really good friends in the summer of grade 8 so... [This friend] is half East Indian and half Guyana, she's quarter Chinese. If you look at her you can't really tell but her last name is Yip and her Dad's half Chinese. That's kind of a mixture I guess and then she's (pointing another girl) kinda East Indian, but Malian?, I don't know that's what she called ......there's a whole bunch of them, like Korean friends, a whole bunch of not just Canadian.

I: What do you mean by "not just Canadian"?

S: Not just .... You know how ... I guess I'd be considered second generation, right? ...Like Caucasian Canadian or .... They're original ... I don't know if you can say ... I don't know ... there's a whole different background and [U.T.].

I: Where's your boyfriend (in the pictures)?

(laugh)

S: He used to be, he's Greek, but not any more. No, he's not up there (referring to the picture), I don't have a picture of him.

I: You also have some Korean friends right?

S: Yeah, ...Kwon, he's Korean. I've got a picture somewhere else, they're Korean people

I: ...but you speak to each other in English, right?

S: We joke around sometimes and speak Korean a little bit...actually a lot of my friends know, like a lot of people at our school know a little, a lot of slang...a little bit of Korean because there's , for some reason it's really weird because I'll be walking down the hallway and I can hear someone speaking Korean and then I'll turn around and he's not Korean at all...they just kind of joke around and say something and a lot of it is bad words. There's this one guy, MM, I sometimes think he knows more Korean than me because he's best friends with H Park and he's Korean and they're really good friends and he teaches him and he sometimes brings him to Korean church and stuff. He knows, he picks up really well. There's a lot of people at school who speak Korean.

I: Do you have a lot of Korean's in your school?

S: I don't know about a lot but there's a few. There's probably Koreans that I don't know so I ...

I: Not as many as in Harry Ainley...

S: Probably not.

I: They also have Korean students who have just come...

S: Yes, there's quite a few. There's different parts of the school and there's this one part that is ESL classrooms. I'll be walking by there to my classes and I can hear, like, there's a group of Koreans and I can, you know, "oh, they're Koreans".

I: They are not in the regular curriculum?

S: At first they're not but then after next year they are. I know that in my Math class there's this girl who came last year.....some of them take regular classes...a lot of them take regular classes.

I: (checks tape).....Can you describe your family a little bit?

S: My family is kind of...I guess everyone has a own different outlook of their family. I used to think that I have a dysfunctional family, not normal and stuff, but to me it's normal. A kind of weird ... I don't know ... I don't see my Dad lots, because before he used to have the restaurant and stuff but now he has the business out in L., so he pretty much lives out there. I see him on Fridays and Mondays. My Mom is here on the weekdays and then he goes up with my Dad on the weekends. Me and my brother I guess we have our usual, normal, occasional brother and sister fight, but.... I like my family because it's really funny. My brother's really funny and my sister's really funny...they do stupid things like I'm used to it because I've been with them all my life so it's kind of like what goes on. I guess other people wouldn't understand so that's what good about it. It's like an original thing. My Grandma's very close to our family because she used to live with us and my Dad's her only son so we see her often. She comes to visit sometimes and we go there and so I don't know what else to say.

I: Well, the reason I'm interested in and asked you about family is that many of the people whom I interviewed often talked about their family, some difficulties in communication with their parents ...

S: Oh yeah, with parents ... yeah

I: Things like their parents are too strict , so sometimes they feel that their friends who don't have such strict parents may not understand them ...

S: Yeah, I know I've mentioned to my friends a lot that, like, when I'm mad at my parents or when we get fights or something, I talk to my friends. My friends understand. Like I said, we have different cultures and backgrounds, so they can understand. I'm not asking them to understand how it feels but they understand, like, "yeah, it must be hard for you" and everything. I tell them how .. it's really frustrating because you want to...even when you want to raise your voice a little and tell them how you feel, they can't understand. They'll either not understand anything you are saying so there's no point in yelling, there's no point in talking to them. Or, if you do try, they just take that one word they might understand and that's just totally far from what you're trying to say, so it gets really frustrating because they talk to you and you're trying to understand what they're saying and they're trying to understand what side they're coming from and how they see things and then you talk back at what you think they're telling you. Then afterwards it's just like, you just get mad because you're just yelling, you don't know what you're saying, you're just yelling. With my Dad it's different because we don't see him that much. But, I know my parents just want us to be happy and stuff and it's difficult because of what they've been raised up with and what they're trying to raise us up with and in a different society and a different culture so I can understand that it's really difficult and I feel really bad about it all the time because I'm being really difficult for them. It's not like I want to be, it's just that it is and then I understand ....really difficult and we have to be the clash between the two worlds but we don't because I was just brought up in this place and now they have do the transition from Korea to Canada. But I was just from Canada maybe go visit Korea, but I don't understand. It's really frustrating, the communication part. But, for the strictness part, I know that a lot of Korean families are strict and stuff, but I think that my parents are OK with us. We know when the limit is and not to go overboard and stuff. I guess on the weekends, I don't have a curfew because my parents are not here. Before they leave they say don't stay out late or maybe you shouldn't go out tonight, I say OK but then I am thinking "how are they going to know anyway because they're not here". So it's hard for them to always keep an eye on us because they're not really here so they have to kind of trust us. I know that's kind of bad going against whatever but I think that they should trust us because I think they do trust me because I won't do anything bad and I don't hang around with a bad group of kids. I trust my friends so.....

I: Can your sister speak Korean?

S: Not that well. All of us don't speak as well as we should but my sister's picking up now because, at her work, she comes in contact with a lot of Korean people so I think that she's picking up a little bit more. I think she knows, I think that my brother and sister know more than me. I don't know. (Laugh).

I: I wish I was the one being asked and being talked with.

S: Why?

I: Cuz then I can just talk about whatever........oh. Besides my ideas come from a very abstract; ideas from literature, whatever and I have to ask you very concrete questions even though I want to know about what the culture is but I cannot ask you: What do you think the culture is? or something like that. So it's really hard but hopefully I can do better.

(laugh)

What about school? Do you like it?

S: I used to love school. I loved elementary and junior high, I used to love school going to see my friends and doing my school work. I used to be a good student but then when I got to high school, in grade 10 I was a good student. It was OK but then after then I stopped trying and then I didn't do very well so I'm really strange(?) cuz I've been .... I guess I was just sloughing off too much. I didn't try now I'm just paying for it so. I like going to school to see my friends and everything and playing sports and stuff but I've begun to dislike the actual school work. Like I know Math and English used to be my favorite subjects and I used to get the best grades in them and now it's like, they're my worst subjects. I don't like them at all. I used to thin they were fun but.........schools OK, I like it. It's.....to an extent. I've gotten really lazy over the.....a lot of students just get really lazy and they stop trying and then when they realize what they've done it's sometimes too late to get back. That's what I realize and I'm paying for it and I'll have to go to summer school.

I: Have you been OK with your social life?

S: Yeah, it's fine. Yeah. I love my friends and everything. Like I've known, I guess those four, I've known them ever since grade 7 and we're really close friends and we met other new people in high school so .... and I've played volleyball with her since grade 8.

I: I don't have a clear picture about schools here or schooling experiences because I am not familiar with Canadian society and Canadian school. Can you just describe a little bit about your high school and if there is anything different from your elementary school and junior high school ...

S: My school.....I've noticed that people I've gone to school with in elementary and then haven't seen them for the longest time and then I'll meet up them maybe once or twice in junior high and then I'll see them again in high school. It's like really weird to see how they changed and what they're doing now.....you didn't think they'd ever smoke and then you see them now and smoke all the time. This is really weird, like wow you know you've changed but they're still your friends because you've known them for a long time but I guess wherever you go there's always going to be also kinda trends and stuff, what's in and what's not and you see that changing a lot and then your groups of friends sort of changes and you change too. That's why I feel that by the time you get at the end of high school and you're out of high school then you'll know who your real friends are and stuff...like who stuck with you and who kinda faded away a bit but you're not crying over about it. These are friends but not your true friends, and then in high school there are a lot of different groups, different cliques that ...... like in the movies you know how you see different groups, like the smokers and the preppie people who hang around different parts of the school? Well that's kind of like in a way that's like at our school, but not as much though. At one side of the school all the people will be out there smoking and then all the people who do jock stuff and go to phys ed., they're like in the gym playing or in the little pit part where we have our activities and stuff. There's a lot of .... when you get to ... I just kinda noticed what I didn't in junior high, but when you get to high school, it's like, you know how ... I guess you associate with [xxx / school?]... when you said there's probably more Koreans at Ainley because people associate..... "There's a lot of Orientals at Ainley and a lot of brown people at Page and stuff like that. And I guess they tend to hang around with their own race and nationalities cuz there's a lot of brown people and then oriental people....

I: They usually hang around with the same people....

S: There's a lot of people who don't, who hangs around with everybody. There's a lot of people we'll know but when you see someone you know like if you see one person turning the corner, there's like a certain group ... if you see one person turning the corner, you know everybody else is going to turn the corner...kind of like that. If I see one person then I know who's going to be following, kind of like that.

I: Most of your friends are not in your high school?

S: Oh yeah they are. They all go to my high school.

I: Oh really?

S: yeah.

I: So then, how come you didn't stay with them, "the same kind of groups"?

S: I don't know. You mean with other Korean people? I don't know ... Actually, when I think right now, like, in junior high, when I think of the Korean people I knew, I'm still friends with them now, except one girl she went, moved to Surrey, BC but I still keep in touch with her and I actually, in elementary and junior high we weren't that great a friends. We weren't really that close, but when she moved I think we started becoming better friends I think. I used to visit her and she used to visit me. And so I don't know. I don't really know that many Koreans, well like I knew most of them I think but there wasn't that many as I remember and then in high school like J., we used to hang out in Grade 9, grade 10 and grade 11 and then in grade 12 we didn't hang out that much more because she was more into studying and I guess couldn't get into it. And then there was H. and C. like I still see them but they hang around ....? I guess I just never really, never really wanted to be in just a Korean group. I didn't like that idea like just to have Korean friends, like I don't want to sound mean or anything but I thought that was just kinda dumb just to have Korean friends. Like you shouldn't just have Korean friends.

I: That's true but, when I talked with some Korean-Canadian kids, some of them expressed a kind of difficulties in trying to get into groups that have been already pretty much established. Like in Harry Ainely, it is hard to make friends with one who belongs to a certain group already because they tend to always stick together.

S: Oh, yeah. But I don't understand why they would want it hard for people to be friends with them.

I: You mean these schools?

S: Yeah, if they think it's hard to be friends with them, like if I was at N school and I saw Korean people and I wanted to be friends with them and I knew it would be hard for other people to become friends with me because they see me with just Korean people and they may think: oh I can't be friends with her. I don't see why I would want to do that cuz I would want to make friends with everybody. I don't understand why anybody would say I want to be with that group because it's harder to be....it's harder for other people to become friends with that group. So I don't understand that because I think it would be totally opposite you'd want to be friends with everybody. That's why, I don't understand, kinda silly. There's no point to it. Like if it's coincidence and there's a lot of Koreans you can be friend, that's fine but I don't see why if you say: oh there's a group of Korean people and I want to be in there because I'm Korean I don't think that's, I think that's all just going for the wrong reasons so, like I don't want to be friends with somebody just because they're wearing all red shirts or something ....

I: Yeah, that's true. But, some kids explained those things that they can share with their Korean or Asian friends rather than with their Caucasian friends.

S: What kind of things though?

I: Well, they vary depending on individuals. Yet, some said that their experiences of their family and friendship as well as their values and life styles have more in common with those of Korean or Asian friends, thus can be shared with them.

S: I would still say that if he was looking for that he can look for that in his Caucasian friends too. Like not all of them are like that but if he thinks are all Korean people are like that then I think that's kind like stereotypical. If I wanted a, like I'm not trying to judge him or anything because I don't know him but if I were him I would be, if I'm looking for a more quiet kind of night or something I have to look toward the Korean people, I would just ask my other friend or something like maybe we can stay home, like that's not. If you don't want to go party with all your friends you might have another friend or you can somebody else. Maybe you just want to stay home tonight or something but, the common ground ... I can understand, like, I guess common ground or whatever, but in a way, cuz , like I find common ground, like I share a lot of the same things with the friends that I have and I don't see nothing wrong with it. With our different cultures and stuff like you know, my friends will come to my house and say like, why do you have carrots on your shelf, and I'll say no, those are ginseng roots.....they'll ask things like that and they'll ask like what's that big box? And I'll say, oh that's a rice dispenser and you know it's neat about what I can learn at their house and they can learn at my house like I don't think....maybe it's because I haven't been around it so I can't......but....

I: Well, maybe it's because you have a different kind of friends, different from his friends...

S: Yeah, yeah. I think it's all just different. Like what I've been subjected to and what he's been subjected to, the kind of people and I guess we kind of have a different belief or opinion on it too because we're different people but, when I think about out of all my girl friends I think I'm the only oriental other than J. but we don't hang around J. that much but I think I'm the only oriental in the group so which is OK because I just think, that's OK because then I'll just stand out more or something. I don't know. It's OK I'm fine with my friends. I'm not looking for anything new.

I: Following what you've said, I don't think this seems to be a proper (?, well) question for you, but, have you ever experienced bad things in relation to being Korean or being different?

S: I guess one of the most recent things, I don't know if I can .. if you can really say it's [U.T.][4] but I remember when I wanted to go get my learners, in the book it says you have to have at least three or two of the, like your first certificate and your school ID, Alberta health care. I had three of them, like it said two or more or three or more but I had one more than I needed I think. And the lady kept asking me if I had a citizenship card. And I was like, I don't have a citizenship card cuz I was born in Canada, I'm a Canadian citizen like I don't have a card to show that cuz I was born here. And she's like, you need a birth certificate or a citizenship card to show you were born here. My parents are Canadian citizens, they came here and they're Canadian citizens, and I was born here and I have these other three pieces of identification and that's all I need, right? like said in the book. But, they were like, "No, you have to come back" and I just felt like maybe it was wrong, but I just felt like they were telling me that kind of thing because I was oriental that, oh she might....

---

[4] Unable to transcribe.

I: Even though you speak perfect English......

S: Yeah and this one lady was helping me and then she asked the lady beside her and ... the other lady beside her, I think she wanted .. looks like she wanted, like, "She has three pieces. Believe ...." she said....no, no I think she has to come back and stuff. I was just like, OK, I was with my best friend and her sister and they're standing up for me, you know, "Hello. It's in the book. She has all those things. Why can't she ..." cuz I was just really, I guess, upset because of what's going on here. I guess that's pretty much the only thing, that I remember. I don't really remember anything big.

I: Did you go back?

S: No, not there cuz I was scared to go back cuz I like, actually I was the last one to get my learners out of all my friends because it takes me forever to do things and then it took me a long time to even go that time and then I didn't go and I didn't go back for a few months cuz I didn't want to go back there. Then I went back to this new one over here and I got it, so....

I: If you were not oriental, I guess she might not have asked another piece of ID, birth certificate or something like that ......

S: That's what I was thinking, but then I thought maybe not. Then I'm thinking why would she be asking me this all the time and I do have all the requirements so I was just kinda upset. Don't they teach them at work you know to......[laugh] but I was upset.

I: But you didn't do anything about it?

S: I was scared because I have never experienced anybody kind of doubting my citizenship or my being here in Canada. I was kinda scared like OK fine we'd just get out of here and I was just kinda scared and upset but..........

I: You've visited Korea, right?

S: I think I was in Grade 5 around when I was in Grade 5 but we just spent most of our time visiting our relatives I didn't know.....

I: Have you met any other Korean students who have just come here?

S: H. I met her a coupe of times. There's this family who after they stayed here for awhile. Their Mom and Dad and....she spoke really good English and although she was living in, I think she was born in Korea. She was living in Korea and she lived in America for a couple of years, I'm not sure. She spoke really good English and we were the same age and like we got along and stuff like I don't know it was OK but not really....I haven't met.....Well like there's this girl at my school, SC, she's in my Math class and I think a couple of years ago she came and I don't talk to her but I smile at her....we smile at each other. In a way it's because I know she's Korean and she knows I'm Korean .... I kinda smile. But I haven't really met anybody that's come over here just to study.

I: Do you talk to Y (her cousin from Korea) a lot?

S: Not like a lot yeah but when she's around and stuff.

I: From your own experiences what do you think Korean culture is?

S: Korean culture?

I: From your own experience. From your contact with Koreans or from your family experience...

S: What do I think of it or what do I think it is?

I: What do you think it is?

S: Um....

I: Or both? What do you think of it?

S: I wouldn't know everything about Korean culture but from what I perceive it to be it would be...it's interesting. Like some of the things, like what happens from we do {OR "some of the things we do"?}, I don't what it's called but when our Grandpa when they set out the table with food and they have a picture up.......

I: *Je-sa*[5]?

S: Yeh, yeh. I think that's neat, I think. And *Se-Bae*[6]. And .... gee I don't know it's a kind of hard....

I: What about values?

S: Korean values?

I: Values can be a part of culture, I think.

S: With school or something, I kind of respect how the Korean students can be devoted to their academics and stuff but sometimes I feel like it's too devoted, it's too, you try too hard when you don't have to I think they over exert themselves on something because it's just expected and like not just their family and their society but from our society now.

I: Really?

S: It's stereotypical, stereotypes like how Americans and, you know, how they see Japan and Korea, like oh, math and they're really smart cuz they go to school and {Ju-Ku?}, or, I don't know, [U.T.] It's like sometimes they just overdo it and I don't know if it's because they want to or they feel the pressure but like if I were them I would feel the pressure not just from my country, not just my family, not just my friends or teachers but from kinda the whole world. That's what society now has portrayed them though because they Oriental people....good at math ....

I: But you don't feel any pressure from it?

S: For me, no. But pressure from my family like, I used to because they used to be like well both my brother and my sister didn't go to university and they're like expecting me to go to university and like I can do it and I felt kind of pressure like OK I'm the last hope now and I have to do it but now it's like I'm going to do whatever I can do, so but I don't know I look up to them because they can sit there and do their work and get good grades and stuff like that but it's just weird because even when Y comes home and she just studies and studies and goes to the library and does work or whatever. I think she told my sister once all she wants to do is just study, study, study or something and I don't understand how anybody can just study, study, study cuz that's crazy I think. So I don't know. It's just weird but ....

I: What about other expectations? Other than academic performance?

S: I guess a lot, like, I guess, I guess it's kind of bad cuz I really don't know a lot but I'm trying to like to compare from what I think Canadian people or other societies have stereotypes of Korean people or oriental people, like you know they might be kinda short and small, whatever, but .... Hey, you're kinda tall for an Oriental, sometimes I'll get that, you're kinda tall, cuz I'm one of the taller ones of my friends and I'll be like, well you know people come in different shapes and sizes, like it doesn't matter. Well like they'll expect, you know you think that a lot of them are quiet or whatever but like I talk a lot. Sometimes I'll talk and talk and talk...and my friends will look at me, well that's kind of the joke about me, Oh Samantha, let her talk, you don't have to understand just nod your head....pretend you're listening because I'll just be....

I: I'm doing that (nodding, laugh)

---

[5] A scrificial rite or a memorial service for ancestors.

[6] A New Year's bow (a formal bow of respect to one's elders on New Year)

S: I'll be just talking and then I'll be like OK. I get distracted easily and I'll just talk, talk, talk, talk. I remember my Dad used to ask my elementary....on report cards my elementary teacher said, Mr. Lee wants to know how Samantha is with other kids in her class. She talks a lot, does she do this because, I guess, he thought that he did it. I used to be shy but I used to talk a lot so I was really shy but I used to talk a lot so it was like two totally different sides I guess. I consider myself a shy person but I consider myself a real out-going person too...............like I don't understand. But like when those two different people or personalities come in it's like I don't have control over. I'm not going to say OK I want to be shy now, I want to talk now and stuff. Like I can talk to a lot of people but when I go out sometimes like when I do this English presentation in front of other people but for some reason I kinda got scared and my voice was kinda shaking when I was reading stuff . I was reading stuff and knew pretty much everybody in the class and then I was ....like I can be in social class and I can be totally fine and I can talk blah, blah, blah and talk normally, so ...It's like really weird but......yeah I talk a lot about nothing. It's weird when people think they know how someone should be because of what they should and then when they meet someone in their personal lives they think: wow like I never knew. It's just really weird. So I don't know.

I: Do you think your parents hold different expectations to your brother compared with their expectations to you or your sister?

S: Yeah, well I think even in other cultures for a guy there are totally different expectations and totally different grounds than for girls. But in a lot of senses in Korean culture, like me being in a Korean family I can see how my brother, like he can.....I can remember when I wasn't allowed, well I'm still not, my Mom prefers me not to sleep over at other peoples houses and stuff. Then in elementary and junior high it would be hard to get my Mom's permission to sleep over at other peoples houses but my brother would be, like, normal. So, it was OK. He didn't have to put up a fight about it or anything. OK fine. I don't know but I think that would be kinda expected in a different Canadian family too but that's another, like if I asked my parents to sleep over, I think my other friends if they asked to sleep over at a friends I think the first thing their parents would want to know, is like, well we don't know her friends. We want to know them better and then we'll let you sleep over or something but in a lot of cases I heard my Mom say: no it would be a burden on the family. You'll be too much for the family. So I think that it was more like respect for the family. Thinking of their responsibility like they'll have to feed you, they'll have to do this and that's what my Mom would say to me not like: well, we'll have to meet them first and then, we don't know them. I felt it was more the family. I don't know if that says anything though but kinda like more family ... that is more valued .....I don't know. I'm trying to explain it but...... kind of like, more family values and ...

I: Have you listened to Korean music? Some Korean kids said it's a kind of trendy.

S: Oh really? I remember when I came back from Korea that one time....I think there was me and my sister. But I remember it was really clear, there was one, I used to know his name, he had this one really nice slow song and I think we got the tape and I'd sing it by hearing, not by knowing the words, kind of imitate his words and I really loved that song but I don't know who that was. And then there's another Korean song that when we went to someone's house to eat dinner and they sang karioke, he sang this one really nice one. It was really nice but I don't know any Korean groups. If I hear a song that I like I'll think: oh that's a really nice song but I won't go out and get that tape or anything like that....

I: Does you family sometimes watch Korean TV?

S: Yeah my Mom watches it a lot.

I: But you don't?

S: Well we sit there and sometime watch it. We used to always watch the singing one, singing competitions ... and me and my sister used to know all the Korean singers like Kim Wan-sun and other people but now we won't............When I watch the soap operas or the dramas since a long time ago and a now I can feel like there's a total change of them. Like now they are kissing on screen. I remember when they used to just hug and the clothes and the image has all changed like wow. Just over a couple of years or so.....It's weird.

I: What is your vision for your future? What do you want to do or to be?

S: I used to want to be a phys. ed. teacher for the longest time. I wanted to a coach in junior high and when I got high school I wanted to be a high school Phy. Ed. teacher and a coach. But, then when I got to Grade 12 I realized that was a unreliable job.

I: Why?

S: Cuz like being a teacher you can get cut back and I don't want to teach in the small towns like I want to be in the city. If I had like my ultimate dream it would be like to compete in the Olympics. That is what I would want to be or I'd want to be like a professional athlete or something but I don't know what I want to be now. But I wouldn't mind starting my own business like my own parents did when they first came from Korea. My aunt and my uncle and my Mom and Dad and a close friend of theirs, they started up that business.... Yeah that's the business they started up when they first came but right now, I wish they'd stayed in the restaurant ? because they were kinda like known. I like the restaurant better and, then my Dad can be living in the city. My Mom would be working and that makes me think I'd like to start my own business. Like open a little place.

(talking about opening a little cafe)

S: Yeah, you want to do your own ... you want to play your own music and serve your own food and whatever you want to do ..... your own ideas.

-- The End --